

The Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization

AN  
*Introduction*  
TO THE  
*Science of the Ḥadīth*

*Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā‘ ‘ilm al-ḥadīth*

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī

Translated by Dr Eerik Dickinson

Reviewed by Professor Muneer Fareed

The Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization

AN  
*Introduction*  
TO THE  
*Science of the Ḥadīth*

*Kitāb Ma‘rifat anwā‘ ‘ilm al-ḥadīth*

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī

Translated by Dr Eerik Dickinson

Reviewed by Professor Muneer Fareed

Garnet  
PUBLISHING

|              |   |     |
|--------------|---|-----|
| Category 32  | Rare Words in the Ḥadīth  | 195 |
| Category 33  | Enchained Ḥadīth  | 197 |
| Category 34  | Abrogating and Abrogated Ḥadīth   | 199 |
| Category 35  | Misreadings in the Isnāds and Texts of Ḥadīth   | 201 |
| Category 36  | Contradictory Ḥadīth  | 205 |
| Category 37  | Additions to Cohesive Isnāds  | 207 |
| Category 38  | Ḥadīth with Hidden Looseness  | 209 |
| Category 39  | The Companions  | 211 |
| Category 40  | The Followers   | 219 |
| Category 41  | Older People Transmitting Ḥadīth from Younger Ones  | 223 |
| Category 42  | Symmetrical Transmissions, and Other Instances of Peers Transmitting from One Another   | 225 |
| Category 43  | Brothers and Sisters among Scholars and Transmitters  | 227 |
| Category 44  | The transmission by Fathers from Their Sons   | 231 |
| Category 45  | The transmission by Sons from Their Fathers   | 233 |
| Category 46  | Those from Whom Two Transmitters, One Early and One Late, both relate   | 235 |
| Category 47  | Companions, Followers and Later Figures from Whom Only a Single Transmitter Related Ḥadīth  | 237 |
| Category 48  | Those Who are Referred to by Different Names or Varying Epithets  | 241 |
| Category 49  | Unique Names, Nicknames and Paidonymics of the Companions, Transmitters of Ḥadīth, and Other Scholars                                     | 243 |
| Category 50  | Names and Paidonymics   | 249 |
| Category 51  | The Paidonymics of Those Better Known under Their Name, rather than Their Paidronymic   | 255 |
| Category 52  | Nicknames of Transmitters of Ḥadīth and Other People Mentioned with the Transmitters  | 259 |
| Category 53  | Homographic Names and Gentilics, and Related Matters  | 265 |
| Category 54  | Homonymic Names, Gentilics, and So Forth  | 277 |
| Category 55  | A Category Composed of the Two Previous Categories  | 283 |
| Category 56  | Transmitters Resembling One Another in Name and Lineage Who Are Distinguished by the Relative Position of the Names of the Son and Father | 287 |
| Category 57  | Those Whose Lineage Refers to Someone Other than Their Father   | 289 |
| Category 58  | Gentilics the Actual Significance of Which Differs from the Apparent One Which First Comes to Mind  | 293 |
| Category 59  | Obscure References  | 295 |
| Category 60  | The Dates of Transmitters   | 299 |
| Category 61  | Reliable and Weak Transmitters of Ḥadīth  | 303 |
| Category 62  | Reliable Transmitters Who Confused Their Ḥadīth at the End of Their Life  | 305 |
| Category 63  | The Generations of Transmitters and Scholars  | 309 |
| Category 64  | Transmitters of Ḥadīth and Other Scholars Who Were Clients  | 311 |
| Category 65  | The Residences and Lands of Transmitters  | 315 |
| Bibliography |   | 319 |
| Index        |   | 329 |

*In the Name of God, the Beneficent, the Merciful*

## FOREWORD

---

THE interrelationship and interaction of human cultures and civilizations has made the contributions of each the common heritage of men in all ages and all places. Early Muslim scholars were able to communicate with their Western counterparts through contacts made during the Crusades; at Muslim universities and centres of learning in Muslim Spain (al-Andalus, or Andalusia) and Sicily to which many European students went for education; and at the universities and centres of learning in Europe itself (such as Salerno, Padua, Montpellier, Paris, and Oxford), where Islamic works were taught in Latin translations. Among the Muslim scholars well-known in the centres of learning throughout the world were al-Rāzī (Rhazes), Ibn Sinā (Avicenna), Ibn Rushd (Averroes), al Khwārizmī and Ibn Khaldūn. Muslim scholars such as these and others produced original works in many fields. Many of them possessed encyclopaedic knowledge and distinguished themselves in many disparate fields of knowledge.

In view of this, the Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization was established in order to acquaint non-Muslims with the contributions Islam has given to human civilisation as a whole. The Great Books of Islamic Civilization Project attempts to cover the first 800 years of Islam, or what may be called Islam's Classical Period. This project aims at making available in English and other European languages a wide selection of works representative of Islamic civilisation in all its diversity. It is made up of translations of original Arabic works that were produced in the formative centuries of Islam, and is meant to serve the needs of a potentially large readership. Not only the specialist and scholar, but the non-specialist with an interest in Islam and its cultural heritage will be able to benefit from the series. Together, the works should serve as a rich source for the study of the early periods of Islamic thought.

In selecting the books for the series, the Center took into account all major areas of Islamic intellectual pursuit that could be represented. Thus the series includes works not only on better-known subjects such as law, theology, jurisprudence, history and politics, but also on subjects such as literature, medicine, astronomy, optics and geography. The specific criteria used to select individual books were these: that a book should give a faithful and comprehensive account of its field; and that it should be an authoritative source. The reader thus has at his disposal virtually a whole library of informative and enlightening works.

Each book in the series has been translated by a qualified scholar and reviewed by another expert. While the style of one translation will naturally differ from another as do the styles of the authors, the translators have endeavoured, to

the extent it was possible, to make the works accessible to the common reader. As a rule, the use of footnotes has been kept to a minimum, though a more extensive use of them was necessitated in some cases.

This series is presented in the hope that it will contribute to a greater understanding in the West of the cultural and intellectual heritage of Islam and will therefore provide an important means towards greater understanding of today's world.

May God Help Us!

Muhammad bin Hamad Al-Thani  
*Chairman of the Board of Trustees*

## ABOUT THIS SERIES

---

THIS series of Arabic works, made available in English translation, represents an outstanding selection of important Islamic studies in a variety of fields of knowledge. The works selected for inclusion in this series meet specific criteria. They are recognized by Muslim scholars as being early and important in their fields, as works whose importance is broadly recognized by international scholars, and as having had a genuinely significant impact on the development of human culture.

Readers will therefore see that this series includes a variety of works in the purely Islamic sciences, such as *Qur'ān*, *hadīth*, theology, prophetic traditions (*sunna*), and jurisprudence (*fiqh*). Also represented will be books by Muslim scientists on medicine, astronomy, geography, physics, chemistry, horticulture, and other fields.

The work of translating these texts has been entrusted to a group of professors in the Islamic and Western worlds who are recognized authorities in their fields. It has been deemed appropriate, in order to ensure accuracy and fluency, that two persons, one with Arabic as his mother tongue and another with English as his mother tongue, should participate together in the translation and revision of each text.

This series is distinguished from other similar intercultural projects by its distinctive objectives and methodology. These works will fill a genuine gap in the library of human thought. They will prove extremely useful to all those with an interest in Islamic culture, its interaction with Western thought, and its impact on culture throughout the world. They will, it is hoped, fulfil an important rôle in enhancing world understanding at a time when there is such evident and urgent need for the development of peaceful coexistence.

This series is published by the Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, which serves as a research centre under the patronage of H.H. Sheikh Muhammad bin Hamad al-Thani, the former Minister of Education of Qatar who also chairs the Board of Trustees. The Board is comprised of a group of prominent scholars. These include His Eminence Sheikh Al-Azhar, Arab Republic of Egypt, and Dr Yousef al-Qaradhawi, Director of the Sira and Sunna Research Center. At its inception the Center was directed by the late Dr Muhammad Ibrahim Kazim, former Rector of Qatar University, who established its initial objectives.

The Center was until recently directed by Dr Kamal Naji, the Foreign Cultural Relations Advisor of the Ministry of Education of Qatar. He was assisted by a Board comprising a number of academicians of Qatar University, in addition to a consultative committee chaired by Dr Ezzeddin Ibrahim, former Rector of the University of the United Arab Emirates. A further committee

acting on behalf of the Center has been the prominent university professors who act under the chairmanship of Dr Raji Rammuny, Professor of Arabic at the University of Michigan. This committee is charged with making known, in Europe and in America, the books selected for translation, and in selecting and enlisting properly qualified university professors, orientalists and students of Islamic studies to undertake the work of translation and revision, as well as overseeing the publication process.

# CENTER FOR MUSLIM CONTRIBUTION TO CIVILIZATION

## BOARD OF TRUSTEES

H.E. Sheikh Muhammad bin Hamad al-Thani  
Chairman

### MEMBERS

1. H.Eminence Sheikh al-Azhar, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.
2. Director-General of the Islamic Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (ISESCO).
3. Director-General of the Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (ALECSO).
4. H.E. the Minister of Education, State of Qatar.
5. H.E. the Minister of Education, Kuwait.
6. H.E. the Minister of Education, Oman.
7. H.E. the Secretary-General of the Muslim World Association, Saudi Arabia.
8. H.E. Dr Ezzeddin Ibrahim, Cultural Advisor to H.H. the President of the U.A.E.
9. Professor Yousef al-Qaradhawi, Director, Sira and Sunna Research Centre, University of Qatar.
10. Chairman, Arab Historians Union.
11. Professor Cesar Adib Majul, Professor at the American Universities.

Following are the names of the late prominent Muslim figures who (may Allāh have mercy upon them) passed away after they had taken vital roles in the preliminary discussions of the Center's goals, work plan and activities. They are:

1. Dr Kamal Naji, former General Supervisor, Center for Muslim Contribution to Civilization, Qatar (7 October 1997).
2. Sheikh Jad al-Haq Ali Jad al-Haq, Sheikh al-Azhar, Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.
3. Dr Muhammad Ibrahim Kazim, former Rector, University of Qatar.
4. Sheikh Abdullah bin Ibrahim al-Ansari, former Chairman, Department for the Revival of Islamic Cultural Heritage, State of Qatar.
5. Muhammad al-Fasi, former Honorary Chairman, Islamic University Rabat, Kingdom of Morocco.
6. Dr Abul-Wafa al-Taftazani, former Deputy Rector, University of Cairo, Arab Republic of Egypt.
7. Senator Mamimatal Tamano, former member of the Philippino Congress and Muslim leader in the Philippines.

# CENTER FOR MUSLIM CONTRIBUTION TO CIVILIZATION

## BOARD

H.E. Sheikh Muhammad bin Hamad al-Thani  
Chairman of the Board of Trustees

Professor Osman Sid-Ahmad Ismail al-Bili  
General Supervisor, Professor of Middle Eastern and Islamic History, University of Qatar

## MEMBERS

1. H.E. Shaykha Ahmad Almahmud, Minister of Education, State of Qatar.
2. Professor Ibrahim Saleh al-Nuaimi, former Rector, University of Qatar.
3. Professor Yousef al-Qaradhawi, Director, Sira and Sunna Research Centre, University of Qatar.
4. Professor Husam al-Khateeb, Professor of Arabic, Cultural Expert, National Council for Culture, Arts and Heritage, State of Qatar.
5. Professor Abd al-Hamid Ismail al-Ansari, College of Sharia, Law and Islamic Studies.
6. H.E. Dr Hasan al-Nimi, Ambassador, State of Qatar.
7. Dr Hasan al-Ansari, Amiri Diwan, College of Arts and Science, University of Qatar.
8. Dr Ahmad Muhammad Ubaidan (Treasurer) Observer, Advisory Council and Director-General, Trans-Orient Establishment (Doha, Qatar).

CENTER'S ADVISORS  
H.E. Dr Ezzeddin Ibrahim  
Cultural Advisor to H.H. the President of the U.A.E.

Professor Raji Mahmoud Rammuny  
Director of the Center's Translation Committee in the U.S.A.  
Professor of Arabic Studies, Department of Near Eastern Studies,  
University of Michigan, U.S.A.

## TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

---

‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth (or ʻilm al-ḥadīth, uṣūl al-ḥadīth, etc.) is the broad designation which includes all of the various disciplines making up the study of ḥadīth.<sup>1</sup> Among the works in this field are certain guidebooks which attempt to summarize the entire range of this material to allow students to understand the terminology of the collectors of ḥadīth and to validate the methods of these collectors. Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalānī (773/1372–852/1449) presents a brief survey of the history of this sub-genre in the introduction to his *Nuzhat al-naẓar*,<sup>2</sup> his commentary on his own *Nukhbat al-fikar*.

The ancient and modern experts had many works about the terminology of the ḥadīth scholars. Among the first to compose a work on this subject was the judge Abū Muḥammad al-Rāmahurmuzī. His book was *al-Muḥaddith al-faṣil*.<sup>3</sup> However, he was not thorough. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī [was another one of the first] but he did not revise and properly arrange [the material].<sup>4</sup> Abū Nu‘aym al-İsbahānī followed him. He did make a supplement (*mustakhraj*) to the book of [al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī], but he left some things for his successors. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī came after them. He composed a book he called *al-Kifāya*<sup>5</sup> on the rules of transmission and another on the guidelines [of transmission] which he called *al-Jāmi‘ li-ādāb al-shaykh wa-’l-sāmi‘*.<sup>6</sup> Few were aspects of ḥadīth on which he did not compose a monograph. As Abū Bakr b. Nuqṭa<sup>7</sup> put it, “Everyone who is fair knows that the scholars of ḥadīth after al-Khaṭīb are dependant on his books.” Some

1 For a brief discussion of this genre, see the article “Uṣūl al-ḥadīth” in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd edn., Leiden, 1953 ff.). The most thorough treatment of the development of this literary genre remains William Marçais’ introduction to his translation of Nawawī’s *al-Taqrīb ma-’l-taysīr li-ma’rifat sunan al-Bashīr al-Nadīr*, which originally appeared in installments in *Journal Asiatique* and was later issued as a separate volume under the title *Le Taqrīb de en-Nawawī* (Paris, 1902).

2 (Benares, 1394/1974), 3–4. See also id., *al-Majma‘ al-mu‘assas bi-’l-Mu‘jam al-mufahras*, ed. Yūsuf ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Mar‘ashlī, 4 vols (Beirut, 1413/1992–1415/1994), 1:185–6.

3 *Al-Muḥaddith al-faṣil bayn al-rāwī wa-’l-wā‘i*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb (Beirut, 1391/1971).

4 *Kitāb Ma‘rifat ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth*, ed. al-Sayyid Mu‘azzam Ḥusayn (Cairo, 1937).

5 *Kitāb al-Kifāya fī ʻilm al-riwāya* (Hyderabad, 1357).

6 (Beirut, 1417/1996).

7 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Baghdādī (579/1183–629/1231) produced a number of works on ḥadīth and gentilic; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt al-a‘yān wa-anbā‘ abā‘ al-zāmān*, ed. Ihsān Abbās, 8 vols (Beirut, 1968–72), 4:292–3.

came after al-Khaṭīb and took a share of this knowledge. Al-Qādī Ṭyāḍ composed a short book which he called *al-Ilmā'* and Abū Ḥafṣ al-Mayānajī [that is al-Mayyāniḥī] wrote a pamphlet which he entitled *Mā lā yasa' u al-muḥaddith jahluhū*.<sup>8</sup>

With the perspective given to him by the passage of two centuries, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī regards *Kitāb Ma‘rifat anwā’ ‘ilm al-hadīth*, more popularly known as the *Muqaddima*, of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī as the most influential work on the study of ḥadīth: “The people took it up and followed its method. The versifiers, epitomizers, supplementers, abridgers, critics and proponents of it are innumerable.” Library catalogs bear witness that for the next few centuries the belief prevailed that the market could always bear another synopsis, in either verse or prose, of the contents of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s work. Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that to this day most traditional ḥadīth scholarship is directly or indirectly based on this one work.

### Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ al-Shahrazūrī

The career of Taqī al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Shahrazūrī<sup>10</sup> was shaped to a remarkable degree by the political currents of his age. He was

<sup>8</sup> *Al-Ilmā'* ilā ma‘rifat uṣūl al-riwāya wa-taqyid al-ilm, ed. al-Sayyid Aḥmad Ṣaqr (Cairo, 1389/1970).

<sup>9</sup> Ed. Subḥī al-Samarra’ī (Baghdad, 1967); trans. L. Librande, *Muslim World*, 72 (1982): 34–50.

<sup>10</sup> The following are the main sources for the life of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ: Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Miṣrāt al-zamān fī ta’rīkh al-‘ayyān*, vol. 8 in 2 parts (Hyderabad, 1370/1951–1371/1952), 8(2):757–8; Abū Shāma, *al-Dhayl ‘ala ‘l-Rawdatayn*, ed. Muḥammad Zāhid b. al-Ḥasan al-Kawtharī (Cairo, 1366/1947), 175–6; Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, 3:243–5; Ibn Rushayd, *Miṣr al-‘ayba bi-mā jumī‘a bi-‘til al-ghayba*, vol. 3, ed. Muḥammad al-Habīb b. al-Khuja (Tunis, 1981), 214–19; Dhahabi, *al-‘Ibar fī khabar man ghabar*, ed. Abū Ḥāfir Muḥammad al-Sa‘īd b. Basyūnī Zaghlūl, 4 vols (Beirut, 1405/1985), 3:246–7; id., *Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā’*, ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā’ūt, 25 vols (Beirut, 1401/1981–1409/1988), 23:140–4; id., *Tadhkirat al-huffāz*, 4 vols (Hyderabad, 1955–8), 4:1430–31; id., *Ta’rīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhir wa-‘l-a‘lām*, ed. Umar ‘Abd al-Salām al-Tadmuri (Beirut, 1407/1987 ff), 53:184–8; Subkī, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iya al-kubrā*, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Muḥammad al-Ḥilw and Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Tanāhī, 10 vols (Cairo, 1383/1963–[1396]/1976), 8:326–36; Asnawī, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iya*, ed. ‘Abd Allah al-Jubūrī, 2 vols (Baghdad, 1970/1390–1391/1971), 2:133–4; Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya ma-‘l-nihāya*, 14 vols (Cairo, 1351/1932–1358/[1939]), 13:168–9; id., *Tabaqāt al-suqahā’ al-Shāfi‘iya*, ed. Aḥmad ‘Umar Ḥāshim and Muḥammad Zaynūm Muḥammad Gharab, 3 vols (Cairo, 1413/1993), 2:857–8; Ibn Rāfi‘, *Ta’rīkh ‘ulamā’ Baghdaḍ (al-musammā Muntakhab al-Mukhtār)*, ed. ‘Abbas al-‘Azzāwī (Baghdad, 1357/1938), 130–3; Ibn Qādī Shuhba, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iya*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Alīm Khān, 4 vols (Hyderabad, 1398/1978–1400/1980), 2:142–6; Ibn Taghrī Birdī, *al-Nujūm al-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wa-‘l-Qāhira*, 16 vols (Cairo, 1348/1929–1392/1972), 6:354; Suyūtī, *Tabaqāt al-huffāz*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar (Cairo, 1393/1973), 499–500; Ulaymī, *al-‘Uns al-jalil bi-ta’rīkh al-Quds wa-‘l-Khalil*, ed. Muḥammad Bahr al-‘Ulūm, 2 vols (Najaf, 1388/1968), 2:104–5; Nu‘aymī, *al-Dāris fī ta’rīkh al-madāris*, ed. Ja‘far al-Hasanī, 2 vols (Damascus, 1948/1367–1951/1370), 1:20–1; Dāwūdī, *Tabaqāt al-mufassirin*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad ‘Umar, 2 vols (Cairo, 1392/1972),

born in the village of Sharakhān<sup>11</sup> located in the region known as Shahrazūr in Kurdish northern Iraq: Although Islamicists and Arabists are not accustomed to directing their attention to this part of the world, at the time of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's birth it was enjoying a period of great cultural efflorescence. Speaking specifically about the area of Shahrazūr, the contemporary historian Yāqūt (d. 626/1229) noted the rapaciousness of the Kurds inhabiting the surrounding mountains and the town's exceptional fertility in talented scholars. He makes particular reference to two famous Shāfi'iite families with roots there, the Banū 'l-Shahrazūrī<sup>12</sup> and the Banū 'Aṣrūn, both of which supplied judges to the Zangids, Ayyūbids and others.<sup>13</sup> Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ does not seem to have been able to lay claim to any blood connection to either of the prominent Shāfi'iite families of al-Jazīra, although his father had studied under Sharaf al-Dīn b. Abī 'Aṣrūn (493/1100–585/1189), who later went on to become a very prominent figure in Zangid Syria.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ began his training in law under his father<sup>14</sup> in Irbil, the capital of one of the minor principalities which lay between the Khwārazmians in the East and Ayyūbids in the West. The sources do not tell us when he arrived there or how long he stayed. However, one cannot help but feel that some elements of his basic religious outlook were forged in this period. As was the case with Shahrazūr, Irbil as portrayed in *Ta'rikh Irbil*<sup>15</sup> of Ibn al-Mustawfi (564/1169–637/1239) enjoyed a much more vigorous intellectual life than one would expect to find. The ruler of Irbil after 586/1190 was a former lieutenant and brother-in-law of Saladin, Muẓaffar al-Dīn Gökböri.<sup>16</sup> As was the case with so many rulers in this period, he took an active interest in religious matters. To judge on the basis of where he spent his money, Gökböri's outlook appears to have been a form of conservative Sunnism which supported traditional manifestations of piety even when they lacked scriptural authority. The scale of his celebrations of the birth of the Prophet finds few parallels in Islamic history.

1:377–8; Mahmūd al-'Adawi, *Kitāb al-Ziyārāt bi-Dimashq*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid (Damascus, 1956), 84–5; Ibn al-Imad, *Shadharāt al-dhahab fi akhbār man dhahab*, 8 vols (Cairo, 1350–51), 5:221–2; Ḥusaynī, *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi'iya*, ed. 'Ādil Nuwayhiq (Beirut, 1971), 220–1; Louis Pouzet, *Damas au VIIe/XIIIe siècle: Vie et structures religieuses [dans] d'une métropole islamique* (Beirut, 1988), 27–31 (under the name of "Abū Ḥaṣṭ Umar Ibn as-Ṣalāḥ").

11 A number of the sources claim that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ was born in the town of Shahrazūr itself.

12 For this family, see Heinz Halm, *Die Ausbreitung der Šāfi'iischen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./14. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1974), 185–7 and A. Ben Abdesselam, "Shahrazūrī," *EF*, 9:219.

13 Yāqūt, *Mu'jam al-buldān*, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld, 6 vols (Leipzig, 1866–73), 3:340–2.

14 By virtue of the tutelage of his father, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ united the "Irāqi" and "Khurāsanī" streams of Shāfi'iism. The genetics of these traditions are discussed in Abū Shāma, *Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Mu'ammil li-'l-radd ila 'l-amr al-awwal* in *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il al-Muniriyā*, 4 vols (Cairo, n.d.), 3:28–31 and Nawawi, *Tahdhīb al-asmā' wa-'l-lughāt*, 4 vols (Cairo, n.d.), 1(1):18–19.

15 Ed. Sāmi b. al-Sayyid Khamās al-Saqqār, 2 vols (Baghdad, 1980).

16 *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, ed. Ehsan Yarshater (New York, 1984 ff.), 8:43–4.

He established a number of charitable foundations in Irbil, including a school of ḥadīth named the Muẓaffariya. He also financed good works in Mecca and Medina and contributed to the construction of the main mosque of the Hanbalites in the Damascene suburb of al-Ṣalīhiya.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ continued his education in Mosul, which by this time was one of the last outposts of the Zangids, a dynasty which originated in northern Iraq and had controlled Syria and Egypt until the advent of the Ayyūbids. There, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, before “his mustache sprouted,” tackled the popular manual of Ḥarāqī Shāfi‘ism, Abū Ishāq al-Shirāzī’s *al-Muhadhdhab fi ’l-furū'*, under the tuition of Ibn Samīn (523/1129–588/1192). The pinnacle of his early academic career was reached when he became a teaching assistant of ʿImād al-Dīn b. Yūnus (535/1140–608/1211),<sup>17</sup> the leading Shāfi‘ite scholar of the city.

There was great interest in ḥadīth in northern Iraq at this time. The most famous member of the Zangid dynasty, Nūr al-Dīn, founded the world’s first school of ḥadīth in Damascus, the Dār al-ḥadīth al-Nūriya, in 566/1170. Schools of ḥadīth had also recently been founded in Irbil and Mosul. Therefore, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s interest in the subject of ḥadīth was probably awakened at an early age. It should be noted that even in this era the study of ḥadīth was not a normal element of the curriculum of the typical student of law. Commentators had occasion to deplore the ignorance of ḥadīth of legal scholars. We are told that in general the only ḥadīth the jurists knew were the ones cited in their legal manuals and these were often viewed as unauthentic by the specialists.<sup>18</sup>

After his time in Mosul, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ made a lengthy journey to the major scholarly centers of the East, including Baghdad, Nishapur, Marv, Qazwin and Hamdan. Despite its crucial importance, this period of his life is particularly obscure and we know little more than the names of the teachers he met. Individuals like Ibn al-Samāni (537/1143–618/1221), Furāwī (ca. 522/1128–608/1212) and al-Mu‘ayyad (or perhaps al-Mu‘ayyid) al-Tūsī (524/1130–617/1220) are now nothing but placeholders in obscure isnāds, but in their day they enjoyed international prestige because they had comparatively short isnāds. Their prominence is reflected in the fact that their reports are the only ones for which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ quotes the isnād *in extenso* in the *Muqaddima*.

The first time we hear of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ in the Ayyūbid lands, where he would spend the rest of his life, is when he was appointed to the professorship of the Asadiya law school<sup>19</sup> in Aleppo. Presumably he took the reins of this Shāfi‘ite law school shortly after the death of his predecessor in 608/1211. It appears that he did not occupy the position very long and he may have left as early as

17 For this individual and his family, see Halm, *Ausbreitung*, 188–9.

18 For example, Abū Shāma, *Mu‘ammil*, 3:28–9; Laknawi, *al-Ajwiba al-fādila li-’l-asīla al-‘ashara al-kāmila*, ed. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda (Aleppo, 1384/1964), 29–33.

19 For this school, see Ibn Shaddād, *al-Āqāq al-khaṭira fi dhikr umarā’ al-Shām wa-’l-Jazira*, vol. 1, part 1 (Aleppo), ed. Dominique Sourdel (Damascus, 1953), 103–4.

610/1213.<sup>20</sup> The reason for this is nowhere specified, although we may assume that his departure was amicable since the post remained in the hands of his family.

What Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did next is unclear. Dhahabī asserts that he studied in Damascus around 613/1216,<sup>21</sup> a *terminus post quem* apparently established by the death of the judge Ibn al-Ḥarastānī (520/1126–614/1217), who is said to have been one of his teachers. We next find Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taking up the professorship of the Ṣalāhiya law school in Jerusalem in 615/1218, in the wake of his predecessor who had been ousted by the Ayyūbid prince al-Mu‘azzam Ḥisā in Damascus for protesting his decision to legalize the sale of wine.<sup>22</sup> The Ṣalāhiya had been established by Saladin in 588/1192 in the Church of St Anne and it was the first Ayyūbid foundation after they captured the city from the Crusaders.<sup>23</sup> It is described as one of “the exalted positions in the kingdom of Islam,”<sup>24</sup> and Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seems to have been successful in his tenure there and may have comfortably continued there indefinitely. As it turned out, he taught there scarcely a year before the Crusades intervened. Al-Mu‘azzam found himself incapable of protecting the city, so to decrease its military value he ordered the dismantling of its walls. Despite many protests, the demolition began on 1 Muḥarram 616/19 March 1219 and this led to a mass exodus from the city. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ joined the “great mob” who “abandoned their possessions and belongings and dispersed in every direction throughout the area.”<sup>25</sup> Unexpectedly, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ found himself out of work and on his way to Damascus.<sup>26</sup>

The Ayyūbid prince al-Mu‘azzam was given control of Damascus in 594/1198. He first ruled in the name of Saladin’s son al-‘Aziz and then in the name of his own father, the brother of Saladin, al-‘Ādil. Al-Mu‘azzam took over in his own name upon his father’s death in 615/1218. He stands as one of the more spectacular figures of Islamic history. A scholar of certain attainments, he was determined to place his personal mark on the intellectual life around him. His most enduring legacy may be the book ascribed to him, *The Missile Hitting its Mark in al-Khaṭib’s Liver* (*al-Sahm al-muṣib fi kabid al-Khaṭib*),<sup>27</sup> a polemical tract refuting the attacks against Abū Ḥanīfa (d. ca. 150/767) made by the Shāfi‘ite

<sup>20</sup> Dominique Sourdel, “Les Professeurs de Madrasa à Alep aux XIIe–XIIIe siècles d’après Ibn Shaddād,” *Bulletin d’études orientales*, 13 (1949–51):102, n. 30.

<sup>21</sup> Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 23:142.

<sup>22</sup> Nu‘aymī, *Dāris*, 1:83.

<sup>23</sup> For this school, see ‘Ulaymī, *Uns*, 2:41, 101–18; ‘Abd al-Latīf al-Ṭibāwī, “Baṣṣ al-madāris al-Islāmiya fi ’l-Quds al-sharif fi ḥakhir al-qarn al-rāsi‘ al-hijri,” *Majallat Majma‘ al-lugha al-‘Arabiya bi-Dimashq* 58 (1403/1983):239–40.

<sup>24</sup> ‘Ulaymī, *Uns*, 2:41.

<sup>25</sup> ‘Ulaymī, *Uns*, 1:402.

<sup>26</sup> Asnawī (*Tabaqāt*, 133) and Ibn Kathīr (*Tabaqāt*, 2:857) claim that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did not settle in Damascus until 630. I can think of no way to account for this obviously incorrect statement.

<sup>27</sup> Published as *Kitāb al-Radd ‘alā Abi Bakr al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādī* (Cairo, 1351/1932).

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (392/1002–463/1071). The book is interesting for a number of reasons, not least for what it reveals about its putative author's preoccupations. The charge to which it responds first and at greatest length is that the imām of the Ḥanafites had a deficient knowledge of the Arabic language. (Of the eponyms of the four main schools of Sunnite law, Abū Ḥanīfa was the only one who was – like al-Mu'azzam – not an ethnic Arab.) Ḥanafism and the Arabic language were the twin passions of al-Mu'azzam's life.

Al-Mu'azzam's Ḥanafism is a mystery both in its origin and its form. He, and his son following in his footsteps, were the only Ḥanafites in a dynasty that was otherwise Shāfi'iite. When asked how he alone in his family happened to be a Ḥanafite, he flippantly replied, "Do you not wish that there be a single Muslim among you?"<sup>28</sup> He studied Ḥanafite law under Jamāl al-Dīn<sup>29</sup> al-Ḥaṣīrī (546/1151–636/1238), the most prominent Ḥanafite of his time in Damascus, and composed, with the help of a ghostwriter, a commentary on Shaybānī's *al-Jāmi'* *al-kabīr*, a standard work on Ḥanafite law.<sup>30</sup> However, in the increasingly conservative spirit of his age, al-Mu'azzam seems to have later moved toward a purer Ḥanafism centering on the school's eponym; one is tempted to say, a fundamentalist Ḥanafism. He commissioned a work called *al-Tadhkira*, a ten-volume digest of the doctrines of Abū Ḥanīfa stripped of the accretions of his students and later followers. Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī (581/1185 or 582–654/1256) tells us that "he was never separated from [this book], whether on a journey or at home. He read it continuously and wrote on the back of each volume, 'Isā b. Abī Bakr b. Ayyūb [al-Mu'azzam] has completed learning [this volume].'"<sup>31</sup> His missionary zeal led him to found a Ḥanafite law school, the Mu'azzamiya, in the Hanbalite enclave of al-Ṣāliḥiyya in 621/1224. His activities in the realm of the Arabic language were less provocative. He sponsored a great lexicographical compilation based on a number of earlier works.<sup>32</sup> Not content to savor his pleasures in private, he paid cash prizes to students who had mastered certain grammatical and lexicographical texts, which did temporarily stir up some interest in these books.<sup>33</sup>

Al-Mu'azzam's reign was an age of relative liberalism. Jews and Christians were allowed to hold public office and build additions on their houses of worship. Wine was legalized so that it could be taxed. The so-called "sciences of the Ancients" (for example, philosophy and Logic) were cultivated and al-Mu'azzam

28 Laknawī, *al-Fawā'id al-bahiya fi tarājim al-Ḥanafiya* (Beirut, n.d.), 152–3.

29 Not "Fakhr al-Dīn," as occurs in Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirāt al-zamān*, 8(2):644.

30 *Mirāt al-zamān*, 8(2):645.

31 *Mirāt al-zamān*, 8(2):647. Ḥajjī Khalifa provides a short description of this work in *Kashf al-zunūn 'an asāmi al-kutub wa-'l-Funūn*, ed. Mehmet Şerefettin Yaltkaya, 2 vols (Istanbul, 1360/1941–1362/1943), 1:cols. 393–4.

32 Nu'aymī, *Dāris*, 2:580.

33 Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirāt al-zamān*, 8(2):647. Ḥajjī Khalifa says that the prince used to give money to students who mastered Shaybānī's *al-Jāmi'* *al-kabīr* and his *al-Jāmi'* *al-saghīr*, two works of Ḥanafite law; *Kashf al-zunūn*, 1:col. 568.

himself was a friend of the speculative theologian Āmīdī (551/1156–631/1234). What al-Mu'azzam could not bring himself to tolerate was the strict literalism advocated by some of the local Ḥanbalites and their restive followers. The profile of the Ḥanbalites in Damascus had been considerably heightened in 551/1156 by arrival of Ḥanbalite refugees fleeing the Crusaders from the area around the Palestinian village of Jammā'il.<sup>34</sup> Their common origin as well as their close family ties gave the immigrant Ḥanbalites a cohesiveness which allowed them to exert far greater influence than their numbers warranted. Their migration to the Damascene suburb of al-Ṣālihiya, which began in 553/1158, only served to prolong and strengthen their unity, which, one imagines, would have rapidly broken down if they had continued to live in the midst of the greater Damascene society. In al-Ṣālihiya they created a vigorous Ḥanbalite intellectual life which would hardly have been augured by the group's rural origin. Two of the greatest names in Ḥanbalism emerged from this milieu, Ibn Qudāma (541/1147–620/1223) and 'Abd al-Ghānī b. 'Abd al-Wāhid (541/1146–600/1203). Despite their suburban exile, the Ḥanbalite refugees continued to play a role within the city walls. Al-Mu'azzam was eventually obliged to grant the Ḥanbalites a *mihrāb* of their own in the Umayyad Mosque, the religious center of the city. This became their base for menacing the local Ash'arites. Fakhr al-Dīn b. 'Asākīr (550/1155–620/1223), Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's unhappy predecessor at the Ṣalāhiya in Jerusalem, had retired to Umayyad Mosque. As an Ash'arite, he was obliged to make circuitous detours to avoid walking near the Ḥanbalites for fear that they would commit an outrage on his person.<sup>35</sup>

Al-Mu'azzam's special antipathy for the Ḥanbalites is illuminated by his famous showdown with the aforementioned 'Abd al-Ghānī in 595/1199.<sup>36</sup> 'Abd al-Ghānī had traveled very extensively and it seems that no one with a religious text to transmit escaped his attention. A pathological troublemaker and career martyr, throughout his life we detect an eagerness to undergo a *mīhna*, or trial, like the one the imām Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal suffered at the hands of the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Ma'mūn and his successors, a subject he treated in a monograph.<sup>37</sup> He chose Isfahan, the hometown of the Ash'arite Abū Nu'aym al-Īṣbahānī

<sup>34</sup> Ibn Tūlūn, *al-Qalā'id al-jawhariya fi ta'rīkh al-Ṣālihiya*, ed. Muḥammad Āḥmad Duhmān, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Damascus, 1401/1980–1401/1981), 1:66–84; Ibn Kinān, *al-Murūj al-sundusiyā al-ṣaṣīha fi talkhīs Ta'rīkh al-Ṣālihiya*, ed. Muḥammad Āḥmad Duhmān (Damascus, 1366/1947), 2–11; Toru Miura, "The Ṣālihiya Quarter in the Suburbs of Damascus," *Bulletin d'études orientales*, 47 (1995):132–3.

<sup>35</sup> Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 138; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 22:188; Kutubī, *Fawāt al-mafayāt*, ed. Ihsān 'Abbās, 5 vols (Beirut, 1973–4), 2:290.

<sup>36</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī, *Mirāt al-zamān*, 8(2):521; Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 16, 46–7; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 21:458–64; Ibn Rajab, *Kitāb al-dhayl 'ala Tabaqat al-Īlanābila*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqī, 2 vols (Cairo, 1952–3), 2:9, 19–26; Ibn Tūlūn, *Ṣālihiya*, 2:441–2; Henri Laoust, *La Profession de foi d'Ibn Battāf* (Damascus, 1958), cxv–cxxxix.

<sup>37</sup> *Kitāb Miḥnat al-imām Āḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* (Cairo, 1991).

(336/948–430/1038), as the place to point out the one hundred and ninety mistakes the latter committed in his *Kitāb Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba*.<sup>38</sup> For this service, the local Ash‘arites almost killed him and he fled the city wearing only a loincloth. In Mosul he taught ‘Uqaylī’s *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ al-kabir*, which contains an uncomplimentary account of Abū Ḥanifa. In response, the local Ḥanafites rose up and had him put in prison. He would have been put to death had a quick-thinking friend not removed the objectionable pages from the book before his enemies could get their hands on it.

In al-Mu‘azzam’s Damascus, ‘Abd al-Ghanī chose the venue of the Umayyad Mosque to announce his anthropomorphic doctrines based on a literal reading of the Qur‘ān. Inevitably, this incited the non-Ḥanbalites and they carried their protest to al-Mu‘azzam and his Commander of the Citadel. A legal opinion was issued declaring ‘Abd al-Ghanī to be an unbeliever and innovator who was not to be left at large among the Muslims. When personally examined, ‘Abd al-Ghanī refused to back down. It was ordered that his *minbar* be smashed and the Ḥanbalites were evicted from the Umayyad Mosque. ‘Abd al-Ghanī must have thought that he had finally found his al-Ma‘mūn in al-Mu‘azzam.<sup>39</sup> Alas, the prominent establishment Ḥanbalite al-Nāṣīḥ b. al-Ḥanbali (554/1159–634/1236) inopportunistly spoiled the tableau by raising a mob and threatening mayhem. At this point the army was called out to protect the Ḥanafite prayer area. Within hours the Ḥanbalites were allowed to resume their position in the Umayyad Mosque. ‘Abd al-Ghanī was obliged to seek martyrdom in Egypt, where he died in 600/1203 on the eve of another banishment.

This would not be a welcoming environment for Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. Although his views were by no means as extreme as those of ‘Abd al-Ghanī – an innate conservatism kept him from indulging in the provocative positions of the most radical Ḥanbalites – they were markedly different from those of al-Mu‘azzam.

[Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ] was a traditionalist following a good doctrine. He abstained from the tendentious interpretation of the theologians. He believed in what was established by the texts. He did not go beyond the texts and he accepted their literal meaning.<sup>40</sup>

According to a titbit of gossip picked up in Mosul by Ibn Khallikān (608/1211–681/1282), who was himself a native of Irbil, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ missed his

<sup>38</sup> ‘Abd al-Ghanī wrote a book entitled *Tabyin al-iṣāba li-awhām ḥaṣalat fī Ma‘rifat al-Ṣaḥāba li-Abī Nu‘aym*; see Ibn Rajab, *Dhayl*, 2:8, 19; Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughith [alā] sharḥ Al Fiyat al-hadith li-q-‘Irāqī*, 2nd edn, 3 vols (Medina, 1388/1968–1389/1969), 3:85; id., *al-I‘lān bi-‘l-tambikh li-man dhamma ahl al-ta‘rīkh*, ed. Franz Rosenthal (Beirut, n.d.), 175; trans. F. Rosenthal, *History*, 406.

<sup>39</sup> I have been unable to locate a copy of A.A. Badawi’s *Ma‘mūn Bani Ayyūb: al-Mu‘azzam ‘Isā* (Cairo, 1953).

<sup>40</sup> Dhahabī, *Tadhkira*, 4:1431.

chance early in life to fit into al-Mu'azzam's personal circle. As a youth he secretly studied Logic under the brother of one of his first teachers, Kamāl al-Dīn b. Yūnus (551/1156–639/1242), a Shāfi'iite prodigy of learning who taught Shaybānī to Ḥanafites, the Gospel to Christians and the Torah to Jews. He made no progress and when Kamāl al-Dīn advised him, "People think well of you and they ascribe irreligion to everyone who studies this subject. You will spoil their opinion of you and not get anything out of this subject," he was willing to drop it.<sup>41</sup> Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ would later sourly dismiss Logic as "pompous words which God has made superfluous for all sane people."<sup>42</sup>

Despite his ideological handicap, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ did what he could to catch the princely eye in Damascus. In 620/1223 we find him among the scholars attending a lesson held to commemorate the interment of al-Mu'azzam's father in the Greater Ḥādīya. He could not yet occupy one of the places of honor on either side of al-Mu'azzam, but he did manage to maneuver himself into a prime position in the second rank, directly in front of him.<sup>43</sup> Sibṭ b. al-Jawzī refers to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's predicament in his self-serving obituary of him.<sup>44</sup> Sibṭ, the grandson of one of history's greatest Ḥanbalites, Abu 'l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī, had seen which way the wind was blowing and converted to Ḥanafism. He then succeeded extraordinarily in insinuating himself into the good graces of al-Mu'azzam. He writes that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ buttonholed him at a shrine in a suburban park and asked him to intercede on his behalf with the prince: "Ask him to give me a school!" Sibṭ says that at the time al-Mu'azzam specifically disliked Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, but does not make clear whether this was because of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's generally conservative outlook or due to some particular offense on his part. Sibṭ claims that he kept after the prince and eventually reconciled him to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's networking finally paid off when he assumed the professorship of the Raḥāwiya in 622/1225. Nevertheless, a rather obscure incident reveals that even now his position remained vulnerable. The school's founder was a wealthy merchant known as Ibñ Rawāḥa, who lived in the school. After his death in 623/1226 (or 622), the famous Sufi Ibñ 'Arabī (560/1165–638/1240) and Abu 'l-Hasan Khaz'al (ca. 547/1152–623/1226), the head of the shrine of 'Alī b. al-Husayn, Zayn al-Ābidīn, in Damascus, came forward and claimed that Ibñ Rawāḥa enjoined them "at night" – in the form of an apparition? – to bear witness on his behalf for the removal of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ. This led to a complex series of events, which none of the sources cares to unravel. Involved seem to have been Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ's refusal to allow the burial of the founder within the precincts of the school and some extremely restrictive stipulations placed on the running of the institution, which apparently could not be enforced. A provision forbidding Jews,

41 Ibñ Khallikān, *Wafayāt*, 5:314; Subkī, *Tabaqāt*, 8:382.

42 Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 23:143.

43 Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 132–3.

44 *Mir'āt al-zamān*, 8(2):758, reading *madrasatan* instead of *madrasataḥū*.

Christians and extremist Hanbalites from setting foot in it is cited. Ibn al-Šalāh weathered the storm and seems to have held the position until his death.<sup>45</sup>

Al-Mu'azzam died in 624/1227 at the age of forty-seven and was succeeded by his son Dāwūd, who continued his policies. Two years later Dāwūd was pushed out by his uncle al-Ashraf. Although al-Mu'azzam and al-Ashraf were born only a day apart, rarely have brothers shown more marked contrasts. While the high-flying al-Mu'azzam was conversing with philosophers and philologists in the sunny gardens of Damascus, al-Ashraf was campaigning ceaselessly in the icy north, extending and defending the Ayyūbid domains. The acquisition of the sandal of the Prophet was his major cultural achievement. While visiting his nephew in the summer of 625/1228, it dawned on al-Ashraf that there was more to life than freezing and fighting and he resolved to take Damascus.<sup>46</sup>

When he finally did, he immediately put his own stamp on the city. If al-Mu'azzam was al-Ma'mūn, al-Ashraf was al-Mutawakkil. Public morality was restored, non-Muslims were put in their place and the rational sciences were forbidden: Al-Ashraf renounced the sin taxes (if not the sins): wine was formally forbidden. The additions to the church of Maryam were torn down and the Christian superintendent of the treasury was humbled. As for the unholy pursuit of philosophy and science, Abū Shāma writes,

Study of the sciences of the Ancients had become widespread during the last years of the reign of al-Mu'azzam b. Abī Bakr and in the reign of his son Dāwūd and that became more common until God extinguished it in the reign of al-Ashraf.<sup>47</sup>

The great Āmidī was put under house arrest, perhaps on the basis of a famous legal opinion given by Ibn al-Šalāh himself.<sup>48</sup>

In this more congenial climate, Ibn al-Šalāh's career took off. The year 628/1231 was particularly notable. This was when he made the pilgrimage to Mecca<sup>49</sup> and became the first professor of the Inner (or Smaller) Shāmiya.<sup>50</sup> The

45 Ibn Shaddād, *al-Ā'lāq al-Khaṭira fi dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa-'l-Jazira: Ta'rīkh madinat Dimashq*, ed. Sāmī al-Dahhān (Damascus, 1375/1956), 241; Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 149; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, 13:116; Nu'aymī, *Dāris*, 1:265–75; 'Almawī, *Mukhtaṣar Tanbīh al-ṭalib wa-irshād al-dāris*, ed. Salāh al-Dīn al-Munajjīd (Damascus, 1366/1947), 43–5; Akram Hasan al-'Ulābi, *Khiṭāt Dimashq* (Damascus, 1410/1989), 120–1. Dhahabī, *Ta'rīkh al-Islām*, 51:138–9.

46 R. Stephen Humphreys, *From Saladin to the Mongols* (Albany, 1977), 199–200.

47 Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 156.

48 *Fatāwā Ibn al-Šalāh* ([Cairo], n.d.), 41–3; *Fatāwā wa-masā'il Ibn al-Šalāh* (sic), ed. 'Abd al-Mu'ti Amin Qal'ajī, 2 vols (Beirut, 1406/1986), 1:209–13. Ibn Qādi Shuhba claims that Ibn al-Šalāh's ban was put into practice; *Tabaqāt*, 2:144.

49 Abū Shāma, *Dhayl*, 160; Ibn Kathīr, *Bidāya*, 129.

50 Ibn Shaddād, *al-Ā'lāq al-khaṭira: Dimashq*, 232; Nu'aymī, *Dāris*, 1:301–13; 'Almawī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 48–9; 'Ulābi, *Khiṭāt*, 126–7. There seems to have been some confusion (see Ibn Shaddād, *al-Ā'lāq al-khaṭira: Dimashq*, 241; Nu'aymī, *Dāris*, 1:277; 'Almawī, *Mukhtaṣar*, 47) as to whether it was the Inner or Outer Shāmiya where Ibn Šalāh taught, Ibn Khallikān (*Wafayāt*, 3:244) explicitly says that it was the Inner.

founder of the school, Sitt al-Shām Zumurrud Khātūn, was one of the grand ladies of the Ayyūdī family. A sister of Saladin and al-Ādil, she had blood ties to over thirty Ayyūbid princes. She devoted her life to good works and every year spent large sums of gold on potions and medicines which were produced in her house in the city and distributed to the populace. She had earlier founded a large school of Shāfi'iite law outside of the city walls and before her death in 616/1220 she arranged to have her house, located near the Bimāristān al-Nūrī, converted into the school of Shāfi'iite law where Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taught.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ reached the peak of his career when al-Ashraf made him the first professor of the Dār al-ḥadīth al-Ashrafiya, one of the two schools of ḥadīth founded by al-Ashraf. One of these, the Ashrafiya al-Barrāniya, was located in the suburb of al-Ṣalīhiya and put under the control of the local Ḥanbalites.<sup>51</sup> The inner Ashrafiya, where Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ taught, was located within the walls of the city of Damascus, near the main gate of the Citadel and was given to the Shāfi'iites. It was constructed on the site of the former home of the prominent general Ṣārim al-Dīn Qāymāz al-Najmī (d. 596/1200), which al-Ashraf purchased in 628/1231 and renovated over the course of two years.<sup>52</sup> The opening of the school in 630/1233 coincided with the arrival of the elevated ḥadīth transmitter Ibn al-Zabidī (d. 631/1234) from Baghdad, who was feted by al-Ashraf during the month of Ramadan and presided over the recitation of Bukhāri's *Sahīh* in the newly opened ḥadīth school.

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ died in his chambers at the Ashrafiya on 25 Rabi' II 643/19 September 1245, during the Khwārazmian and Egyptian siege of Damascus. The blockade caused a severe famine within the city and a number of prominent scholars were carried off. Nevertheless his funeral was very well attended. Ceremonies were performed in the Umayyad Mosque and the crowd followed the funeral procession to the city gate known as Bāb al-Faraj. Inside of the gate, the ceremonies were re-enacted. Then a brave group of men hitched up their gowns and hastily delivered his remains to its burial site at the edge of the cemetery known as Maqābir al-Ṣūfiya. In later years, his tomb was visited as a site of blessing and it was said that a prayer made there would be fulfilled.

### The *Muqaddima*

Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ intended the *Muqaddima* to be a basic introduction to the study of ḥadīth.

*This book is an entryway into the study of ḥadīth, an attempt to make clear its main and secondary issues and to explain the terminology, aims*

51 For this school, see Nu'aymi, *Dāris*, 1:47–55; Ibn Ṭulūn, Ṣalīhiya, 1:155–64; 'Almawi, *Tanbih*, 12–13; Ibn Kinān, *Murūj*, 39–40; 'Abd al-Qādir Badrān, *Munādamat al-aṭlāl wa-musāmarat al-khayāl*, ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh (Damascus, n.d.), 32–4; 'Ulābī, *Khitāṭ*, 74–5.

52 Nu'aymi, *Dāris*, 1:19–47; 'Almawi, *Tanbih*, 10–12; Badrān, *Munādamat al-aṭlāl*, 24–32; 'Ulābī, *Khitāṭ*, 75–7.

and concerns of its practitioners. Ignorance of these matters greatly impairs a transmitter. This book is – God willing – worthy of receiving attention before any other.<sup>53</sup>

The *Muqaddima* began as a series of individual lectures which were only later placed in the present arrangement.<sup>54</sup> In composing the *Muqaddima*, Ibn al-Šalāh drew heavily on the works of most of his predecessors in the field and the final product bears an especially strong resemblance to al-Hākim al-Nīsābūrī's *Kitāb Ma'rifat 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*. Considering this, it should not surprise us to read that at one point in his life Ibn al-Šalāh undertook to write a commentary on al-Hākim's book.<sup>55</sup> We may safely surmise that the commentary, which he never completed, grew into the *Muqaddima*. Ibn al-Šalāh made no attempt to conceal his debt to al-Hākim. He gave his work, popularly known as the *Muqaddima*, an almost identical title, *Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā' 'ilm al-ḥadīth*,<sup>56</sup> and adopted al-Hākim's conceit of dividing the study of ḥadīth into a number of individual categories (sing. *naw'*), although he thoroughly reorders them and adds thirteen new ones, bringing the total to sixty-five.

How can we explain the astonishing success of this work, since it clearly broke little new ground in terms of its basic format? Where the *Muqaddima* did represent more of a departure from its predecessors was in its style. Abū Bakr b. Muṣaddī (ca. 593/1196–663/1264) described how it appeared to contemporary eyes:

[Ibn al-Šalāh] composed a *fīqhī* book on the sciences [of ḥadīth] and followed a theoretical course in its laws. He used to favor reason over reports (*athar*) and analogy over anecdotes (*khabar*). In [this work] he prepared principles of which no clear representation had [hitherto] been made.<sup>57</sup>

Ibn al-Šalāh wrote the *Muqaddima* like a law book rather than a ḥadīth book. Most notably he eschewed the ponderous habit of most of the writers on ḥadīth of quoting earlier authorities at length. Writers on ḥadīth had hitherto been averse to speaking in their own voice, adding only a sentence or two of their own composition here and there to highlight the significance of the quoted material. In addition to making their books long-winded and cumbersome, this taxed the reader's patience and attentiveness. Although the *Muqaddima* still includes a good deal of quoted material, it does so much less than its predecessors. The easier style probably contributed greatly to the popularity of the work.

<sup>53</sup> *Muqaddima*, 436.

<sup>54</sup> Ibn Ḥajar ascribes the deficiency he perceives in the arrangement of the book to this procedure; *Nuzhat al-naẓar*, 5.

<sup>55</sup> Ibn Rūshayd, *Miṣb al-ṣayba*, 3:218.

<sup>56</sup> Ibn al-Šalāh knew the title of al-Hākim's work to be *Kitāb Ma'rifat anwā' 'ulūm al-ḥadīth*, see *Muqaddima*, 213.

<sup>57</sup> Ibn Rāfi', *Ta'rikh*, 132.

### This Translation

I have relied largely on two modern editions of Ibn al-Šalāh's text, *Nūr al-Dīn Ḥitr's 'Ulūm al-hadīth li-Ibn al-Šalāh* (Damascus, 1387/1966) and the late 'Ā'ishah 'Abd al-Rahmān's *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Šalāh* (2nd edn, Cairo, 1989). In the instances where I was able to consult the relevant manuscripts, it appears that in most cases the readings that Professor Ḥitr gives are to be favored where they disagree. Nevertheless, the copious supplementary material Professor 'Abd al-Rahmān provided makes her edition indispensable to the serious student.

Two procedures I have adopted may require some explanation. I have been sparing in the use of brackets to indicate material not present in the original text, especially when it is merely a question of meeting the demands of English usage. I have used brackets when supplying additional elements to names mentioned in the text in the hope of rendering them more easily identifiable to the reader, when providing short explanatory notes, when the material supplied is more extensive and when it seemed to me to be more open to dispute. I should also draw attention to a practice I have adopted in an effort to render the text clearer to the average reader. Ibn al-Šalāh did not have at his disposal that great scholarly convenience, the footnote. He therefore had to incorporate his digressions in the body of the text. In the instances where these are relatively lengthy or interrupt the flow of the argument, I have distinguished them by presenting them as an indented text block.

Despite all appearances to the contrary, I have attempted to keep the footnotes to a minimum. The *Muqaddima* amply exemplifies what Professor Franz Rosenthal has called the philnomynous character of Islamic scholarship. I have tried to identify all of the individuals mentioned in the text at the first appearance of their name. Ibn al-Šalāh cites a number of extremely obscure, usually very early, figures as illustrations of particular phenomena. In the cases where little seems to have been known about the person, apart from the characteristic which prompted Ibn al-Šalāh to mention him, I have merely provided a reference to the entry on him in one or two of the standard biographical dictionaries. Ibn al-Šalāh quotes extensively from his predecessors. Where he provides a clue about the specific written source from which he drew the quotation, I have attempted to provide adequate bibliographical information. It should be noted that in almost every instance there is some variation, usually minor, between Ibn al-Šalāh's rendering of the quoted passage and the way it appears in the modern printed edition of the same text.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the help I received from others. A generous grant I received from the American Philosophical Society allowed me to travel to Syria and Egypt in the summer of 1996. Professor Raji Rammuny, the coordinator of the series in which this volume appears, has shown great patience and helped me overcome a number of obstacles. Professor 'Abd al-Rahmān (perhaps better known under her nom de plume "Bint al-Shāṭi") freely provided valuable assistance and advice. I would especially like to express

my gratitude to Professor Rosenthal. He has on occasions too numerous to mention allowed me to benefit from his vast expertise on questions both general and specific. To him I dedicate this translation.

## AUTHOR'S INTRODUCTION

---

"Our Lord, give us mercy from You and grant us guidance in our affair."<sup>1</sup>

Praise – the most complete and highest praise – be to God, the Guide for those who seek His guidance, the Guardian of those who fear Him and the One who suffices for those who seek His approval. The most perfect prayers and blessings on our Prophet, the other prophets and the family of each so long as someone asks for His forgiveness and invokes His mercy. Amen! Amen!

The science of hadith is one of the best of the excellent sciences and one of the most beneficial of the useful disciplines. Manly and virile men – that is, thorough and complete scholars – love it and the only people who dislike it are contemptible and base. It is one of the sciences with the greatest relevance to the various other sciences, especially applied law (*fiqh*), which is the central science. For that reason, the errors of those writers on applied law who are unfamiliar with the science of ḥadīth are numerous and the imperfections in the remarks of those scholars who forsake it are plain.

Formerly the stature of hadith was exalted. The throngs of ḥadīth students were massive and the capabilities of the experts<sup>2</sup> in the discipline and the transmitters of ḥadīth were high. Through their living the different sciences of ḥadīth were made vital, through their continued existence the branches of the various sub-disciplines of ḥadīth were kept fresh and the abodes of ḥadīth were occupied by its students. These students and experts have now died off and the sciences of ḥadīth have been obliterated to such an extent that the practitioners in ḥadīth are only a tiny band, few and weak in number. For the most part, in taking up ḥadīth they are concerned with nothing more than hearing them heedlessly, and in recording ḥadīth they do not expend more effort than to write them down defectively. They toss aside the various sciences of ḥadīth through which the stature of ḥadīth became exalted and they have made themselves remote from the bodies of knowledge which made it magnificent. Just when someone examining a difficulty in the science of ḥadīth could hardly find anyone capable of explaining

---

1 Qur'añ 18:10.

2 *Huffāz* (sing. *ḥāfiẓ*): Later scholars attempted to define the qualifications theoretically necessary for a transmitter of ḥadīth to earn this designation; see, for example, Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalāni, *al-Nukat 'ala Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. Rabi' b. Hādi 'Umayr, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Riyadh, 1408/1988), 1:268; Sakhāwi, *al-Jawāhir wa-'l-durar fī tarjamat shaykh al-Islām Ibn Ḥajar*, ed. Ḥāmid 'Abd al-Majid and Tāhā al-Zaynī, only one vol. published (Cairo, 1406/1986), 1:28–45; Suyūṭī, *Tadrīb al-rāwī fī sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawā'im (sic)*, ed. 'Abd al-Wahhab 'Abd al-Latīf, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Cairo, 1385/1966), 1:44–52.

it and someone who wanted to pursue the science of ḥadīth could hardly come across anyone knowledgeable in it, generous God (He is blessed and exalted and He deserves all praise) bestowed a blessing in the form of the book *Kitāb Ma‘rifat anwā‘ ilm al-ḥadīth* (*Knowledge of the Categories of the Science of Hadith*). This book divulged the hidden secrets of the science of ḥadīth, explained its stubborn difficulties, made firm its joints, set down its rules, illuminated its lineaments, clarified its rulings, detailed its subcategories and shed light on its principles, elucidated its branches and subsections, brought together its various sciences and benefits and tracked down its stray and valuable points. I beseech, entreat and humbly pray to God, the Great – in whose hand lie harm and benefit and granting and forbidding –, seeking His favor by every means and requesting His intercession in every way, that He make this book replete in that regard – and more replete – and that He make it ample for all of that – and more ample – and that He make the reward for it and the benefit of it great in this world and the next. God is near and He answers our prayers. I will have no success without God. Upon Him I rely and to Him I turn repently.

This is a list of the Categories of ḥadīth:

1. Sound ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-ṣahīh min al-ḥadīth*)
2. Fair ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-ḥasan minhu*)
3. Weak ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-dā‘if minhu*)
4. Supported ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-musnad*)
5. Uninterrupted ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-muttaṣil*)
6. Raised ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-marfū‘*)
7. Halted ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-mawqūf*)
8. Cut-off ḥadīth, and they are different from interrupted ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-maqṭū‘ wa-huwa ghayr al-munqati‘*)
9. Loose ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-mursal*)
10. Interrupted ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-munqati‘*)
11. Problematic ḥadīth, and this is followed by the discussion of some subsidiary issues, including the isnād containing the word “‘an” (from) and the suspension of ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-mu‘dal wa-yalihi tafri‘at minhā fi ‘l-isnād al-mu‘an‘an wa-minhā fi ‘l-ta‘liq*)
12. Misrepresentation and the treatment of misrepresented ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-tadlīs wa-hukm al-mudallas*)
13. Anomalous ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-shādhah*)
14. Unfamiliar ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-munkar*)
15. Analysis, parallelisms and attestations (*ma‘rifat al-i‘tibār wa-‘l-mutāba‘at wa-‘l-shawāhid*)
16. Additions of reliable transmitters and the treatment of them (*ma‘rifat ziyādāt al-thiqāt wa-hukmihā*)
17. Isolated ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-afrād*)
18. Defective ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-ḥadīth al-mu‘allal*)
19. Disrupted ḥadīth (*ma‘rifat al-muḍtarib min al-ḥadīth*)

20. Material interpolated into ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-mudraj fi 'l-ḥadīth*)
21. Forged ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-mawḍū'*)
22. Mixed-up ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-maqlūb*)
23. The characteristic of those whose transmission is accepted and those whose transmission is rejected (*ma'rifat ṣifat man tuqbalu riwāyatuhū wa-man turaddu riwāyatuhū*)
24. The methods of hearing and receiving ḥadīth, and this chapter includes an exposition on the forms of licensing and their treatment as well as the rest of the ways of taking up and receiving ḥadīth – it contains much information (*ma'rifat kayfiyat samā' al-ḥadīth wa-tahammulihī wa-fīhi bayān anwā' al-iżāza wa-ahkāmihā wa-sā'ir wujūh al-akhḍh wa-'l-tahammul wa-fīhi 'ilm jamm*)
25. The writing of ḥadīth and the means of fixing and recording texts, and this chapter contains excellent and important information (*ma'rifat kitābat al-ḥadīth wa-kayfiyat qabṭ al-kitāb wa-taqyidihi wa-fīhi ma'ārif muhimma rā'iqa*)
26. The manner of relating ḥadīth, the stipulation regarding the conveyance of them and related matters, and this chapter contains many of the valuable points of this science (*ma'rifat kayfiyat riwāyat al-ḥadīth wa-sharṭ adā'ihi wa-mā yata'allaqu bi-dhālikā wa-fīhi kathīr min nafā'is hādha 'l-ilm*)
27. Guidelines for the transmitter of ḥadīth (*ma'rifat ādāb al-muḥaddith*)
28. Guidelines for the student of ḥadīth (*ma'rifat ādāb ṭālib al-ḥadīth*)
29. Elevated and low isnāds (*ma'rifat al-isnād al-īḍī wa-'l-nāzīl*)
30. Famous ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-mashhūr min al-ḥadīth*)
31. Rare and scarce ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-gharib wa-'l-azīz min al-ḥadīth*)
32. Rare words in the ḥadīth (*ma'rifat gharib al-ḥadīth*)
33. Enchained ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-musalsal min al-ḥadīth*)
34. Abrogating and abrogated ḥadīth (*ma'rifat nāsikh al-ḥadīth wa-mansūkhīhi*)
35. Misreadings in the isnāds and texts of ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-muṣahħaf min asānīd al-ḥādīth wa-mutūnihā*)
36. Contradictory ḥadīth (*ma'rifat mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*)
37. Additions to cohesive isnāds (*ma'rifat al-mazid fī muttaṣil al-asānīd*)
38. Ḥadīth with hidden looseness (*ma'rifat al-marāsil al-khafi irsāluhā*)
39. The Companions (God be pleased with all of them) (*ma'rifat al-Sāḥaba*)
40. The Followers (God be pleased with all of them) (*ma'rifat al-Tābi'īn*)
41. Older people transmitting from younger ones (*ma'rifat al-akābir al-ruwāt 'an al-aṣāghir*)
42. Symmetrical transmissions, and other instances of peers transmitting from one another (*ma'rifat al-mudabbaj wa-mā siwāhu min riwāyat al-aqrān ba'dihim 'an ba'd*)
43. Brothers and sisters among scholars and transmitters (*ma'rifat al-ikhwā wa-'l-akhawāt min al-ūlamā' wa-'l-ruwāt*)
44. The transmission by fathers from their sons (*ma'rifat riwāyat al-ābā' 'an al-abnā'*)
45. The opposite of that; that is, the transmission by sons from their fathers ('aks dhālikā ma'rifat riwāyat al-abnā' 'an al-ābā')

46. Those from whom two transmitters related, one early and one late, with a great difference between their date of death (*ma'rifat man iṣhtaraka fi 'l-riwāya 'anhu rāmiyān mutaqaddim wa-mutā'akhkhir tabā'uda mā bayna wafātayhim*)
47. Those from whom only a single transmitter related ḥadīth (*ma'rifat man lam yarwi 'anhu illā rā'iwan wāhid*)
48. Those who are referred to by different names or varying epithets (*ma'rifat man dhukira bi-asmā' mukhtalifa aw nu'ūt muta'addida*)
49. Unique names of the Companions, transmitters of ḥadīth and other scholars (*ma'rifat al-mufradāt min asmā' al-Šahāba wa-ruwāt wa-'l-'ulamā'*)
50. Names and paidonymics (*ma'rifat al-asmā' wa-'l-kunā*)
51. The paidonymics of those better known under their name, rather than their paidronymic (*ma'rifat kuna 'l-ma'rūfin bi-'l-asmā' dūna 'l-kunā*)
52. Nicknames of transmitters of ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-qāb al-muḥaddithin*)
53. Homographic [names and gentilics] (*ma'rifat al-mu'talif wa-'l-mukhtalif*)
54. Homonymic [names and gentilics] (*ma'rifat al-muttafiq wa-'l-mustariq*)
55. A Category composed of the two previous Categories (*naw'i yatarakkabu min hādhayni 'l-naw'iayn*)
56. Transmitters resembling one another in name and lineage who are distinguished by the relative position of the names of the son and father (*ma'rifat al-ruwāt al-mutashābihin fi 'l-ism wa-'l-nasab al-mutamāyizin bi-'l-taqdim wa-'l-ta'khir fi 'l-ibn wa-'l-ab*)
57. Those whose lineage refers to someone other than their father (*ma'rifat al-mansūbin ilā ghayr ābā'ihim*)
58. Gentilics the actual significance of which differs from the apparent one (*ma'rifat al-ansāb allati bātinuhā 'alā khilāf zāhirihā*)
59. Obscure references (*ma'rifat al-mubhamāt*)
60. The dates of transmitters, including their deathdate and other relevant dates (*ma'rifat tawārikh al-ruwāt fi 'l-wafāyāt wa-ghayrihā*)
61. Reliable and weak transmitters of ḥadīth (*ma'rifat al-thiqāt wa-'l-du'afā' min al-ruwāt*)
62. Reliable transmitters who confused their ḥadīth at the end of their life (*ma'rifat man khallata fi ākhir ʻumrihi min al-thiqāt*)
63. The generations of transmitters and scholars (*ma'rifat tabaqāt al-ruwāt wa-'l-'ulamā'*)
64. Transmitters of ḥadīth and other scholars who were clients (*ma'rifat al-mawāli min al-ruwāt wa-'l-'ulamā'*)
65. The residences and lands of transmitters (*ma'rifat awqātān al-ruwāt wa-buldānihim*)

That is the last of the Categories but it is not the last of what is possible in that regard. The science of ḥadīth can be divided into countless categories, since the states and characteristics of ḥadīth transmitters and the states and characteristics of ḥadīth texts are endless. Every one of these states and characteristics deserves to be mentioned separately and requires its own specialists – for each is a Category in its own right – but that would be an endless task. God is enough for us and an excellent protector.

## Category 1

### SOUND ḤADĪTH

(*Ma‘rifat al-ṣahīḥ min al-ḥadīth*)

---

Know – may God enlighten you and me – that ḥadīth, in the view of the scholars of this discipline, fall into the divisions of “sound” (*ṣahīḥ*), “fair” (*ḥasan*) and “weak” (*da‘īf*). The sound ḥadīth is a “supported” ḥadīth (*al-ḥadīth al-musnad*), the isnād of which coheres continuously through the transmission of one upright and accurate person from another up to its point of termination. The sound ḥadīth can be neither “anomalous” (*shādhah*) nor “defective” (*mu‘allal*). These descriptions exclude the “loose” (*mursal*), “interrupted” (*munqati‘*), “problematic” (*mu‘dal*) and anomalous ḥadīth; the ḥadīth containing an impairing defect (*illa*); and the ḥadīth the transmitter of which suffers from any variety of discreditation (*jarḥ*) – these are Categories which will be discussed below, God (He is blessed and exalted) willing. This is the ḥadīth which is indisputably judged to be sound among the scholars of ḥadīth.

Sometimes the scholars of ḥadīth differ over the soundness of certain ḥadīth, either because of their disagreement over whether these characteristics are found in them or because of their disagreement in stipulating the necessity of some of these characteristics, as in the case of the loose ḥadīth. When they say, “This is a sound ḥadīth,” what is meant is that its support (*sanad*) is cohesive and it possesses the rest of the aforementioned characteristics. The standard of the sound ḥadīth does not require that it be definite that the ḥadīth is sound in reality, since this standard admits the ḥadīth that a single upright transmitter is alone in relating and this type of ḥadīth is not one of the reports (*akhbār*) which the Community unanimously agreed to receive with acceptance. In the same way, when they say regarding a ḥadīth that it is “unsound,” this is not a definite statement that it is actually a falsehood, since it may in reality be a truth. All that is meant is that its isnād is not sound according to the aforementioned standard. God knows best.

### Some Important Notes

1. Sound ḥadīth fall into the categories of “agreed upon” (*muttafaq ‘alayhi*) and “disputed” (*mukhtalaf fihi*), as was noted above, and they also fall into the categories of “well known” (*mashhūr*) and “rare” (*gharib*), and categories in between. The grades of sound ḥadīth vary in potency according to the degree that the ḥadīth possesses the aforementioned characteristics upon which soundness is based. In view of this, sound ḥadīth can be divided into innumerable subcategories. For this reason, we think it is better to refrain from judging any isnād or ḥadīth to be the absolutely most sound, although a number of the authorities in ḥadīth have ventured into that morass and their opinions were therefore contradictory.

We heard<sup>1</sup> that Ishāq b. Rāhawayh<sup>2</sup> said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri<sup>3</sup> from Sālim<sup>4</sup> from his father.”<sup>5</sup> We also heard something similar from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.<sup>6</sup> We heard that ‘Amr b. ‘Alī al-Fallās<sup>7</sup> said, “The soundest isnād is Muḥammad b. Sirīn<sup>8</sup> from ‘Abida<sup>9</sup> from ‘Alī.”<sup>10</sup> We heard something similar from ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī<sup>11</sup> and this view was related from others as well. There are some who specify the transmitter from Muḥammad [b. Sirīn], some making him Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī<sup>12</sup> and others Ibn ‘Awn.<sup>13</sup> One of the things we hear from Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn<sup>14</sup> is that he

1 *Ruwina*: In his *Tabaqāt al-fuqahā’ al-Šāfi‘īya* (ed. Muhyī al-Dīn ‘Alī Najīb, 2 vols, Beirut, 1413/1992, 1:77), Ibn al-Šalāh explained that he used this term in the instances where he had an isnād which for the sake of brevity he did not reproduce. For the vocalization of “ruwīnā,” see ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nabulust, *Idāh mā ladaynā fi qawl al-muḥaddithin “rawaynā”*, Maktabat al-Asad (Damascus), no. 14123 ff., 29a–31b.

2 Abū Ya‘qūb Ishāq b. Rāhawayh (or Rāhawayha, 161/778–238/853) was one of the most important of the adherents of ḥadīth of his era; *EP*, 3:902; Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schriftstums*, 10 vols. (Leiden, 1967–95), 1:109–10.

3 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Shihāb al-Zuhri (ca. 50/670–124/742) was an important figure in the history of ḥadīth; *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st edn, 4 vols (Leiden, 1908–36), 4:1239–41; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:280–83.

4 Abū ‘Umar (or Abū ‘Abd Allāh) Sālim (d. 106/724), the son of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, was famed for his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:457–67.

5 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abd Allāh was the son of the second Caliph ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (r. 13/634–23/644). He died in 73/692 at over eighty years of age; *EP*, 1:53–4.

6 The doctrines of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal (164/780–241/855) would eventually form the basis of the Ḥanbalite law school. His ḥadīth criticism and legal opinions have been collected in a number of works and a very large collection of ḥadīth, called “musnad,” is ascribed to him; *EP*, 1:272–7; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:502–9.

7 Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Amr b. ‘Alī al-Fallās was born around 160/776 and died in 249/863; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:470–72.

8 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sirīn (ca. 33/653–110/729) was a Baṣrān authority in ḥadīth whom later generations regarded as an expert in dream interpretation as well; *EP*, 3:947–8; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:633–4.

9 Abū Muslim ‘Abida b. ‘Amr al-Salmānī (d. 72/691) was a well-respected Kūfān scholar. There is a good deal of confusion concerning the various elements of his name; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:40–4.

10 ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was one of the first men to convert to Islam and the son-in-law of the Prophet Muḥammad. He served as the fourth caliph from 35/656 until his assassination in 40/661; *EP*, 1:381–6; *EIr*, 1:838–48.

11 Abū ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī (161/777–234/849) was one of the greatest ḥadīth critics of his generation. His judgements are preserved in his *al-‘Ilal* (ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Aṣzāmī, 2nd edn, Beirut, 1980) and in many later sources; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:108.

12 Abū Bakr Ayyūb b. Abī Tamīma Kaysān al-Sakhtiyānī (68/688–131/748) was a famed Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:87–8.

13 Abū ‘Awn ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Awn al-Muzānī (66/686–151/768), like Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, was a Baṣrān scholar of ḥadīth renowned for his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:364–75.

14 The ḥadīth criticism of Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn (158/775–233/847) is preserved in his *Ta‘rīkh* (ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Nūr Sayf, 4 vols, Mecca, 1979), composed by his student ‘Abbas al-Dūrī (d. 271/884), and in a number of other works. Later authorities frequently cited his opinions; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:106–7.

said, “The finest isnād is al-A‘mash<sup>15</sup> from Ibrāhim<sup>16</sup> from ‘Alqama<sup>17</sup> from ‘Abd Allāh.”<sup>18</sup> We heard that Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba<sup>19</sup> said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Zuhri from ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn<sup>20</sup> from his father<sup>21</sup> from ‘Alī [b. Abī Ṭalib].” We heard that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī<sup>22</sup> – the author of the *Saḥīḥ* ([Collection of] Sound Ḥadīth) – said, “The soundest of all isnāds is Mālik<sup>23</sup> from Nāfi‘<sup>24</sup> from [‘Abd Allāh] b. ‘Umar.” The authority Abū Manṣūr ‘Abd al-Qāhir b. Ṭāhir al-Tamimi<sup>25</sup> extrapolated from this that the most exalted isnād must be Shāfi‘ī<sup>26</sup> from Mālik from Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar, and he cited as proof the consensus of the scholars of ḥadīth that there was no transmitter from Mālik more exalted than Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with all of them). God knows best.

15 Abū Muḥammad Sulaymān b. Mihrān al-Asadī (61/681–148/765), nicknamed al-A‘mash, was a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth and expert on the Qur’ān who taught in al-Kūfa; *EI*, 1:431.

16 Abū Ḥimrān Ibrāhim b. Yazid al-Nakha‘ī (ca. 50/670–ca. 96/715) was one of the most prominent of the early jurists of al-Kūfa; *EI*, 9:921–2; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:403–4.

17 Abū Shībāl Alqama b. Qays al-Nakha‘ī al-Kūfī (d. ca. 62/682) was a prominent Kūfan legal scholar; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:53–61.

18 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd al-Hudhalī was an energetic teacher of the ḥadīth of the Prophet who died in Medina in 32/653; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 1:461–500.

19 Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Abī Shayba Ibrāhim al-Kūfī (159/775–235/849), known as Ibn Abī Shayba, was the author of an important early collection of ḥadīth called *al-Muṣannaf* (Hyderabad, 1386/1966 ff.); *EI*, 3:692; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:108–9.

20 ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib (ca. 38/659–94/712), known as Zayn al-‘Abidin, was the fourth imām of the Twelver Shiites; *EI*, 1:849–50.

21 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn was one of the beloved grandsons of the Prophet. His father was the Prophet’s confidant and son-in-law ‘Alī and his mother was Fāṭimā. He died in the Battle of Karbalā in 61/680; *EI*, 3:607–15.

22 Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il al-Bukhārī (194/810–256/870) was the author of the most famous ḥadīth collection, popularly known as *Saḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (published a number of times), and a number of other important works of ḥadīth scholarship; *EI*, 1:1296–7; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:115–34.

23 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Mālik b. Anas al-Asbahī (93/712–179/795) was the greatest scholar in the city of Medina during his lifetime and the eponym of the Mālikite law school. His views are preserved in his *al-Muwaṭṭa*, which has reached us in a number of recensions; *EI*, 6:262–5; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:457–64.

24 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nāfi‘ (d. ca. 117/735), the client of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, was a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth; *EI*, 7:876–7.

25 ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037) was a Shāfi‘īte polymath who is now best known for his heresiographical work *al-Farq bayn al-firaq*; Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Leiden, 1943–9), 1:482, *Supplementbände*, 3 vols (Leiden, 1937–42), 1:666–7; *EI*, 1:909; *EI*, 3:409–10.

26 Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi‘ī (150/767–204/820) was the eponym of the Shāfi‘īte law school and an influential figure in the development of Islamic legal thought; *EI*, 9:181–5; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:484–90.

2. When, in the personal ḥadīth collections<sup>27</sup> and other books which are in circulation, we encounter a ḥadīth sound in regard to its isnād, but we do not find it included in either of the two Ṣahīhs or designated as sound in any of the other well-known and authoritative compositions (*muṣannafāt*) of the leaders in ḥadīth; we do not presume to judge it conclusively as sound. These days it is no longer feasible for someone to apprehend sound ḥadīth on his own by merely examining isnāds. This is because in every isnād of that kind of ḥadīth you find among its transmitters someone who merely relied upon what was in his book in its transmission and lacked the level of retention, accuracy and exactitude stipulated for sound ḥadīth. So, for the recognition of sound and fair ḥadīth, the matter reverts to relying on what the authorities in ḥadīth designated as such in their well-known and authoritative compositions, which have been rendered safe from alteration and corruption by the circumstance that they are widely known. The continuance of the chain of the isnād – by which this Community (may God augment its glory) has been distinguished – has become the principal reason for the circulation of isnāds apart from [those in the authoritative collections]. Amen!

3. Bukhārī – that is, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ismā‘il al-Bukhārī al-Ju‘fī, a client of the Ju‘fīte tribe – was the first to compose a collection containing only sound ḥadīth. Abu ’l-Husayn Muṣlim b. al-Ḥajjāj al-Nisābūrī al-Qushayrī<sup>28</sup> – a member of the tribe of Qushayr – followed him. Although Muṣlim took ḥadīth from Bukhārī and studied under him, he did share most of his teachers.<sup>29</sup> The books of Bukhārī and Muṣlim are the soundest books after the august book of God [that is, the Qur’ān]. The statement we repeatedly heard from Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) – and others related it with different wording – : “I do not know of a more correct book of religious knowledge in the world than the book of Mālik [that is, *al-Muwatta*]” was made by him before the books of Bukhārī and Muṣlim came into existence. The book of Bukhārī is the sounder of the two in regard to being a collection of sound ḥadīth and also the more useful. There is nothing wrong with the statement we heard from the expert Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥafīz

27 *Ajzā’ al-ḥadīth*: Tahanawi defines *juz'* (pl. *ajzā’*) as “a book collecting the ḥadīth of a single individual;” *Kashshāf iṣṭilāhāt al-funūn*, 2 vols ([Istanbul], 1317), 1:206. Students frequently gathered the ḥadīth of a particular transmitter in this form to bring to his class for audition and occasionally these works found their way into general circulation. Some of the most renowned *juz’*’s are listed in Ḥajji Khalifa, *Kashf*, 1:cols 583–90 and Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Kattānī, *al-Risāla al-mustajrafa bi-bayān mashhūr kutub al-sunna al-musharrifa*, 3rd edn (Damascus, 1383/1963), 86–94.

28 In addition to his *Ṣahīḥ* (published several times), Muṣlim (d. 261/875) composed a number of important works on the study of ḥadīth, several of which will be mentioned in the course of the present translation; *EP*, 7:691–2; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:136–43.

29 From the fact that Muṣlim studied under Bukhārī, the scholars of ḥadīth would as a matter of course have inferred that Muṣlim belonged to the generation after that of Bukhārī, rather than the same one, as was actually the case.

al-Nīsābūrī<sup>30</sup> (the teacher of the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim<sup>31</sup>): “There is no book on earth sounder than the book of Muslim b. al-Hajjāj,” and there is nothing wrong with the doctrine of the North African scholars who prefer the book of Muslim to that of Bukhārī; if what is meant is that the book of Muslim is superior since no unsound ḥadīth are mixed into it. After the introductory chapter of Muslim’s book, only sound ḥadīth are enumerated in it and they are not coupled with ḥadīth like those occurring in the chapter headings of Bukhārī’s book for which he did not provide isnāds meeting the standard stipulated for sound ḥadīth. It does not necessarily follow from this that the book of Muslim is superior to the book of Bukhārī in what pertains to the essence of a book of sound ḥadīth. If what is meant by these views is that the book of Muslim is sounder as a book of sound ḥadīth, it redounds against whoever says it. God knows best.

4. Bukhārī and Muslim did not include all of the sound ḥadīth in their *Sahīhs* and they did not take it upon themselves to do that. In fact, we often heard that Bukhārī said, “I put into *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘* (*Comprehensive Collection*; that is, his *Sahīh*) only what was established as sound and I left out some sound ḥadīth for fear of prolixity.” We heard that Muslim said, “I did not place here” – that is, in his book, the *Sahīh* – “all of the ḥadīth I consider to be sound. I put here only those ḥadīth they accepted unanimously.”<sup>32</sup> He meant – and God knows best – that he only put in his book the ḥadīth which in his opinion met the standards of the ḥadīth unanimously regarded as sound, even if in the opinion of certain people some of these ḥadīth do not appear to meet these standards.

The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Akhrām<sup>33</sup> said, “Few are the well-established ḥadīth that escape Bukhārī and Muslim,” – that is, in their books. One should say that they are *not* few. *Al-Mustadrak ‘ala ’l-Sahīhayn*<sup>34</sup> (*The Supplement to the Two Sahīhs*) of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim is a large book which includes a good deal of what escaped their notice. Even if an

30 Abū ‘Alī al-Husayn b. ‘Alī al-Nīsābūrī (277/890–349/960) was one of the great ḥadīth scholars of his age and is best known, as this passage indicates, for being the mentor of al-Hākim al-Nīsābūrī; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:51–9.

31 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh (321/933–405/1014), also known as al-Hākim al-Nīsābūrī and Ibn Bayyīf, was one of the most prolific authors on the subject of ḥadīth during the fourth/tenth century. Two manuals of ḥadīth from his pen have survived. The larger, *Kitāb Ma‘rifat ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth*, Ibn al-Ṣalāh used as a model for the *Muqaddima*. His shorter manual, *al-Madkhāl ilā ma‘rifat al-Iklīl*, has been edited and translated by James Robson (London, 1953); *EP*, 3:82; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:221–2; *EIr*, 1:250–51.

32 *Al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 8 vols (Istanbul, 1329–33), 2:15 (K. al-Ṣalāt).

33 The sources ascribe a number of works with interesting titles to Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb b. Yūsuf al-Shaybānī al-Nīsābūrī (250/864–344/955). Regrettably, none of them seems to have survived; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:466–9.

34 4 vols (Hyderabad, 1334–42).

argument may be made against Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim regarding some of his ḥadīth, many of his sound ḥadīth remain untainted. Indeed, Bukhārī said, “I have one hundred thousand sound ḥadīth and two hundred thousand unsound.” The total in his book *Sahīḥ* is 7,275 ḥadīth, including some repeated ḥadīth. It has been said that with the omission of the duplicates the total is four thousand. In their<sup>35</sup> opinion, however, this figure may include the accounts (*āthār*) of the Companions and Followers,<sup>36</sup> and often a single ḥadīth related with two isnāds is counted as two ḥadīth.

The augmentation of the sound ḥadīth beyond the contents of the two books: those who seek this should obtain their additions from the ḥadīth clearly designated as sound in one of the famous, authoritative compositions of the leaders in ḥadīth – like Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī,<sup>37</sup> Abū Ḥāfiẓ al-Tirmidhī,<sup>38</sup> Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Nasā’ī,<sup>39</sup> Abū Bakr b. Khuzayma,<sup>40</sup> Abu ’l-Ḥasan al-Dāraquṭnī<sup>41</sup> and others. For this, it is not enough that the ḥadīth merely be found in the books of Abū Dāwūd, Tirmidhī, Nasā’ī and the rest of those who brought together sound and other ḥadīth in their works. In contrast, the mere presence of a ḥadīth in the books of those of them who stipulate that the ḥadīth they collect be sound – like the book of Ibn Khuzayma – does suffice. We regard in the same fashion the material found in the books providing versions of the ḥadīth in the book of Bukhārī and the book of Muslim (God be pleased with them) with variant isnāds<sup>42</sup> – like the

35 The antecedent of this pronoun appears to be those who provided the figure of four thousand.

36 In the broadest sense, the Companions (*Sahāba*) were the early Muslims who had contact with the Prophet, although the exact form of contact required was disputed. The Followers (*Tābi’ūn*) were the students of the Companions; see *EP*, 8:827–9 and 10:28–30. These two groups are discussed in depth below, in Categories 39 and 40.

37 Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Ash’ath al-Sijistānī (202/817–275/889) was the compiler of the famous *Kitāb al-Sunan* (published several times); *EP*, 1:114; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:149–52.

38 The ḥadīth collection of Abū Ḫāfiẓ Muḥammad b. Ḫāfiẓ b. Sawra al-Tirmidhī (210/825–279/892) is commonly called *al-Jāmi’ al-sahīh*, although *Ibn al-Salāh* would prefer simply *al-Jāmi’*. It is available in a number of editions; *EP*, 4:796–7; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:154–9.

39 Abu ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. Shu‘ayb al-Nasā’ī (215/830–303/915) was born in Nasā in Khurāsān and traveled extensively, collecting and teaching ḥadīth, before settling in Egypt. His famous ḥadīth collection is now known as *Kitāb al-Sunan* (published several times); *EP*, 7:969–70; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:167–9.

40 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Iṣhāq b. Khuzayma al-Nisābūri (223/838–311/924) was a famous expert in ḥadīth. His *Mukhtaṣar al-Mukhtaṣar min al-Muṣnad al-sahīh* is popularly known as *Sahīḥ Ibn Khuzayma* (ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-A‘zamī, 2 vols, Beirut, 1391/1971); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:601.

41 Abu ’l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ʿUmar al-Dāraquṭnī (306/919–385/995) composed a ḥadīth collection named *Kitāb al-Sunan* (4 vols, Cairo, 1386/1966) and a number of other works concerning the study of ḥadīth; *EP*, 2:136; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:206–9.

42 *Al-kutub al-mukharraja ‘alā kitāb al-Bukhārī ma-kitāb Muslim*: Sakhawī defined “*istikhraj*” – the form of the word later scholars preferred to *takhrīj* – as follows: “An expert takes, for instance, the *Sahīḥ* of Bukhārī and he presents the ḥadīth from it one by one with his own isnāds, without stipulating for himself that the transmitters be reliable;” *Fath al-Mughīth*, 1:39.

books of Abū ‘Awāna al-Isfārāyīnī,<sup>43</sup> Abū Bakr al-İsmā‘īlī,<sup>44</sup> Abū Bakr al-Barqānī<sup>45</sup> and other works – which completes the abridged ḥadīth and provides commentary on many of the ḥadīth of the two *Şahīhs*. A considerable amount of this kind of material is found in *al-Jam‘ bayn al-Şahīhayn* (*The Union of the Two Şahīhs*) of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Humaydī.<sup>46</sup>

The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakīm occupied himself with augmenting the number of sound ḥadīth beyond the contents of the two *Şahīhs*. He collected [the fruit of his research] in a book he called *al-Mustadrak* in which he placed the ḥadīth not found in either of the two *Şahīhs* which he regarded as meeting the standard of the two teachers [that is, Bukhārī and Muslim] – that is, they had included material from the transmitters of the ḥadīth in their book – or as meeting the standard of Bukhārī alone or that of Muslim alone. In addition, al-Ḥakīm included the ḥadīth that his own efforts led him to regard as sound, even if they did not meet the standard of either Bukhārī or Muslim. He is liberal in interpreting the standard of the sound ḥadīth and free in applying it. It is best that we take a moderate position regarding him. We say: A ḥadīth he reckons to be sound, if we do not find it regarded as sound by any other authority, is, even if it is not sound, a fair ḥadīth to be cited as a proof and acted upon, unless a defect positively determining its weakness appears in it. In this respect, the *Şahīh* of Abū Ḥātim b. Ḫibbān al-Bustī<sup>47</sup> (God bless all of them) is similar to it. God knows best.

5. The books providing versions of the ḥadīth in the book of Bukhārī or the book of Muslim (God be pleased with them) with variant isnāds: the authors of these books did not take it upon themselves to match Bukhārī and Muslim in regard to the exact wording of the ḥadīth without addition or omission. This is

43 The book of Abū ‘Awāna Ya‘qūb b. Ishaq al-Isfārāyīnī (d. 316/928) was named *al-Musnad al-mukharraj ‘ala Kitāb Muslim ibn al-Hajjāj* (published as *Musnad Abi ‘Awāna*, 2 vols, Hyderabad, 1362–3); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:174.

44 The book of Abū Bakr Ahmad b. İbrahim al-İsmā‘īlī (277/890–371/981), *al-Mustakhraj ‘ala ’l-Şahīh*, was based on Bukhārī’s work; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:202.

45 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Muḥammad al-Barqānī (336/948–425/1034) was a teacher of al-Khatīb al-Baghdādī; *EIr*, 3:821. The title of the work referred to here seems to have been *al-Jam‘ bayn al-Şahīhayn*; see Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 599.

46 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Abī Naṣr al-Humaydī (ca. 420/1029–488/1095) was an Andalusian scholar who traveled to the East and died in Baghdad; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:413, *Suppl.*, 1:578–9; *EF* 3:573–4. For a description of his *Jam‘*, see Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 1:cols 599–600.

47 Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḫibbān al-Bustī (ca. 270/884–354/965) was one of the greatest ḥadīth scholars of the fourth/tenth century. His *al-Musnad al-şahīh ‘ala ’l-taqāsim wa-’l-anwā’ min ghayr mujūd qat’ fi sanadihā wa-lā thubūt jark fi nāqilihā* was later rearranged by ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Alī b. Ḫalbān al-Fārisī (d. 739/1339) as *al-Ihsān fi taqrīb Şahīh Ibn Ḫibbān* (ed. Shūayb al-Arnawīt, 18 vols, 1408/1988); *EF*, 3:799; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:189–91.

because in pursuit of elevation of isnād<sup>48</sup> they related these ḥadīth from sources other than Bukhārī or Muslim and thus some variation in wording occurs in them. This is also the case with the ḥadīth authors included in their own independent compositions – like *al-Sunan al-kabir* (*Great Book of Sunnas*) of Bayhaqī,<sup>49</sup> *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (*Explanation of the Sunna*) of Abū Muḥammad al-Baghawī<sup>50</sup> and others – for which they say, “Bukhārī” – or “Muslim” – “included it.” Nothing more may be inferred from that other than that Bukhārī or Muslim included the archetype (*asl*) of that ḥadīth, it being probable that there is a difference in wording between the two versions. There may also be some variation in the meaning and I have in fact found some ḥadīth in which there is a degree of variation in regard to the sense. When that is the case, you may not transmit a ḥadīth from these books, saying, “It occurs in this form in the book of Bukhārī” – or “the book of Muslim” – unless you compare its wording [with the version given by either Bukhārī or Muslim to verify this] or the author who provides the version with the alternate isnād has said, “Bukhārī included it with this wording.”

These works differ from the abridgements of the two *Sahīhs*. The authors transmit in their abridgements the wording of the two *Sahīhs*, or that of one of them. However, one of these works, Ḥumaydī al-Andalusī’s *al-Jam‘ bayn al-Sahīhayn*, does include additional supplementary material for some of the ḥadīth, as we mentioned above. Occasionally a person who does not know better transmits something he finds in this book as if it were from one or both of the *Sahīhs*, and he falls into error because it is one of these additions not present in either of the two *Sahīhs*.

Two benefits are derived from the aforementioned versions with variant isnāds of the ḥadīth in the two books [that is, the *Sahīhs* of Bukhārī and Muslim]. The first is elevation of isnād. The second is the augmentation of the extent of the sound ḥadīth by their additional words and their supplements to some of the ḥadīth. The soundness of these additions is established by these variant versions, because these versions come with isnāds established in one or both of the *Sahīhs* and emanate from that well-established source.<sup>51</sup> God knows best.

48 ‘Ulūm al-isnād: The fewer intermediaries mentioned in an isnād, the more “elevated” it was considered; see below, Category 29.

49 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Husayn al-Bayhaqī (384/994–458/1066) was an important Shāfi‘īte who wrote a number of works on ḥadīth, including his *al-Sunan al-kabir* (published as *Kitāb al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 10 vols, Hyderabad, 1344–55); Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:446–7, *Suppl.*, 1:618–19; *EP*, 1:1130.

50 Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn b. Maṣṭūd b. Muḥammad al-Baghawī (433/1042–516/1122) was a pious scholar who worked hard to popularize the study of ḥadīth. *Sharḥ al-Sunna* (ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā’ūt and Muḥammad Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh, 16 vols, Damascus, 1390/1971 ff.) is one of his most famous works; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:447–9, *Suppl.*, 1:620–22; *EP*, 1:893.

51 Sakhawī asserts that the *mukharrīj* was obliged to select the versions of the ḥadīth with isnāds which were identical to the original ones for as many links as possible, unless there was a compelling reason not to do so; *Fath al-Mughīth*, 1:39. It has been asserted (*pace* Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ)

6. The ḥadīth that Bukhārī and Muslim (God bless them) provide with an uninterrupted isnād in their books: these beyond a doubt represent the material they judged as sound. There is doubt about some of the “suspended” ḥadīth (*mu'allaq*); that is, the ḥadīth with an isnād from the beginning of which one transmitter or more is omitted. The majority of these are in the book of Bukhārī; there are very few in the book of Muslim. We should say: These and similar ḥadīth which contain an expression decisively and conclusively indicating their ascription to the person from whom they are “suspended” – for example, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) *said* (*qāla*) such and such,” “Ibn ‘Abbas<sup>52</sup> *said* such and such,” “Mujāhid<sup>53</sup> *said* such and such,” “Affān<sup>54</sup> *said* such and such,” “Qa‘nabi<sup>55</sup> *said* such and such,” “Abū Hurayra<sup>56</sup> *related* (*rawā*) such and such,” and similar expressions – are judged to be established as actually coming from that person. On the basis of all of these expressions, it is determined that the person to whom Bukhārī ascribed the ḥadīth spoke and related [the text that follows]. Bukhārī would not have deemed it permissible to state this [that is, to use these unequivocal expressions] without qualification unless it was established in his view that the ḥadīth came from the person to whom it is ascribed. If the transmitter from whom the ḥadīth is suspended is not a Companion, the judgement regarding the soundness of the ḥadīth depends on the cohesiveness of the isnād between that person and the Companion.

The phrases containing no decisive and conclusive indication in their wording – for instance, “Such and such was *related from* (*ruwiya ‘an*) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him),” “Such and such was *related from* X,” “On this topic we find such and such *from* (*‘an*) the Prophet (Peace be upon him),” and similar expressions: none of them contains any decisive indication establishing it as coming from the person to whom Bukhārī ascribed it, because expressions like these are also used with weak ḥadīth. However, Bukhārī’s inclusion of this kind of ḥadīth among the sound ḥadīth provides an indication of the soundness of its archetype which one can be comfortable with and rely upon. (God knows best.) Indeed, few of Bukhārī’s suspended ḥadīth fail to attain the standard of the sound ḥadīth and in his book these are found in certain places in the headings

that the soundness of the isnāds of the alternate versions was confirmed only insofar as they were identical to those in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*; W. Marçais, *Taqrib*, 9, n. 3.

52 Abu ‘l-‘Abbās ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās (d. ca. 68/687) was a Companion of the Prophet who was especially expert in the interpretation of the Qur’ān; *EF*, 1:40–41; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:25–8.

53 Abu ‘l-Ḥajjāj Mujāhid b. Jabr al-Makki (ca. 21/642–ca. 104/722) was best known as an expert in the Qur’ān; *EF*, 7:293; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:29.

54 Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Affān b. Muṣlim al-Ṣaffār (ca. 134/751–220/835) was born in al-Baṣra and taught ḥadīth in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:102.

55 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abd Allāh b. Maṣlāma al-Qa‘nabi (ca. 130/748–221/836) was a long-time student of Mālik; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:257–64.

56 The Companion Abū Hurayra al-Dawṣī (d. ca. 59/679) was a major transmitter from the Prophet. There is considerable controversy surrounding the other elements of his name; *EF*, 1:129.

of the chapters, not in the substance of the book and its prime subject matter as indicated by the title he gave it, *al-Jāmi' al-musnad al-ṣahīḥ al-mukhtaṣar min umūr Rasūl Allāh wa-sunanīhi wa-ayyāmihī* (*The Comprehensive Collection of Supported Sound Hadith Summarized from the Actions, Practices and Battles of the Messenger of God*).

The applicability of Bukhāri's statement, "I put into *Kitāb al-Jāmi'* only what was established as sound," goes back to the distinction which we explained. The same is true of the applicability of the statement of the expert Abū Naṣr al-Wā'ilī al-Sijzī,<sup>57</sup> "Scholars, the jurists and others, unanimously agree that if a man had sworn to divorce his wife if not all of the ḥadīth related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in the book of Bukhāri were established as being authentically from him and said by him, there would no doubt about it: the man did not break his oath and the wife remains as before in his snare." This is also true of the statement of Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Humaydī in his book *al-Jam' bayn al-Ṣahīhayn*, "These two [that is, Bukhāri and Muslim] are the only old authorities (God be pleased with all of them) we found who clearly expressed soundness to us in all of what they brought together." All of that refers to the substance and the prime subject of the book and the texts in the chapters, rather than the chapter headings and the like, because in some of these chapter headings there is material that is absolutely not sound. An example of this is Bukhāri's chapter on the ḥadīth concerning the thigh where he relates from Ibnu 'Abbās, Jarhad,<sup>58</sup> and Muḥammad b. Jaḥsh<sup>59</sup> from the Prophet, "The thigh is one of the privy parts."<sup>60</sup> Another example is his remark in the first of the chapters concerning the major ablution, "Bahz b. Ḥakim"<sup>61</sup> said from his father from his grandfather from the Prophet, "God most deserves that one have shame before Him,"<sup>62</sup> and this definitely fails to meet Bukhāri's standard. For that reason, Humaydī did not include it in his *al-Jam' bayn al-Ṣahīhayn*. So note that, for it is significant yet not readily apparent. God knows best.

57 The most important work of the anti-Ash'arite polemicist Abū Naṣr 'Ubayd Allāh b. Sa'īd b. Ḥatīm al-Wā'ilī al-Sijzī was *al-Ibāna al-kubrā*, in which he argued that the Qur'ān is uncreated. He died in 444/1052 in Mecca; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:654–7.

58 Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Jarhad b. Rizāh (or Khuwaylad) al-Aslāmī was a Medinese Companion who died in 61/681; Ibnu 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Isṭī'āb fī ma'rīfat al-Āshāb*, ed. 'Ali Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, 4 vols (Cairo, n.d.), 1:270–71.

59 As a child, the Companion Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Jaḥsh al-Asādī joined his family in emigrating to Ethiopia. After their return to Mecca, they emigrated to Medina; Ibnu 'Abd al-Barr, *Isṭī'āb*, 3:1373–4.

60 *Kitāb al-Jāmi' al-ṣahīḥ*, ed. Ludolf Krehl and T.W. Juynboll, 4 vols (Leiden, 1862–1908), 1: 105 (K. al-Ṣalāt, B. Ma yudhkaru fi 'l-fakhidh).

61 The ḥadīth transmitter Abū 'Abd al-Malik Bahz b. Ḥakim al-Qurayshī died sometime before 150/767; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:253.

62 *Kitāb al-Jāmi' al-ṣahīḥ*, 1:79 (K. al-Ghusl, B. Man iqtasala 'uryānan).

7. Since the question of the recognition of sound ḥadīth ultimately reverts to the material the authorities included in their compositions which are responsible for declaring them to be sound, as mentioned above, the need to direct our attention to the subcategories of sound ḥadīth is, as a consequence, urgent.

- a. The sound ḥadīth included by both Bukhārī and Muslim.
- b. The sound ḥadīth included only by Bukhārī, that is, as opposed to Muslim.
- c. The sound ḥadīth included only by Muslim, that is, as opposed to Bukhārī.
- d. The sound ḥadīth which meet the standard of both of them, but which were not included by them.
- e. The sound ḥadīth which meet the standard of Bukhārī, but which were not included by him.
- f. The sound ḥadīth which meet the standard of Muslim, but which were not included by him.
- g. The ḥadīth regarded as sound by others, but which do not meet the standard of either Bukhārī or Muslim.

These are the main subcategories. The highest is the first, and it is one which the scholars of ḥadīth often call “agreed upon to be sound” (*sahīḥ muttafaq ‘alayhi*). When they apply that term without qualification, they mean by it the agreement of Bukhārī and Muslim on it, and not the agreement of the Muslim Community. However, the agreement of the Muslim Community on it necessarily follows from the agreement of Bukhārī and Muslim and is concurrent with it, because of the agreement of the Muslim Community to receive with acceptance whatever Bukhārī and Muslim agreed upon. The soundness of this entire subcategory is definitely settled. Theoretical and certain knowledge<sup>63</sup> occurs through it, contrary to the doctrine of those who deny this, arguing that their agreement does not in principle produce more than the presumption (*zann*) [that the ḥadīth is sound]. They claim that the Muslim Community received these ḥadīth with acceptance only because it is obliged to act on presumption, although presumption sometimes errs. Formerly, I had inclined toward this view and regarded it highly. Then it became clear to me that the doctrine we<sup>64</sup> had chosen in the first place is the correct one, because the presumption of someone who is protected (*maṣūm*) from error is never wrong and the Muslim Community, when united by consensus (*fi ijmā‘ihā*), is protected from error. For this reason, consensus based on someone’s personal endeavor (*ijtihād*) is a decisive proof, and

63 *Al-ilm al-yaqīnī al-nazārī*: In discussing this passage, Ibn Hajar noted that *al-ilm al-nazārī* differs from *al-ilm al-darūrī* in that the former admits doubt while the latter does not. He equated *yaqīn* with *qaṭ’* and interpreted it to mean that Ibn al-Şalāh was asserting that these ḥadīth possess an absolute level of soundness which renders comparisons between them impossible, a view which Ibn Hajar did not personally endorse; *Nukat*, 1:379.

64 The reason for the shift from the first person singular to the first person plural is not clear.

most of the cases of the consensus of scholars are of that kind. This is a precious and useful point.

One of the ramifications of this is the doctrine that the ḥadīth which either Bukhārī or Muslim is alone in including come under the heading of what is decisively regarded as sound because of the Muslim Community's reception of each of their books with acceptance in the fashion detailed by us in the preceding paragraph. This applies to all but a few insignificant items which some of the critics among the experts of ḥadīth – like Dāraqutnī<sup>65</sup> and others – have discussed. These are known to the scholars in this field. God knows best.

8. When it becomes clear, from what we said above, that the way to identify sound and fair ḥadīth is now confined to the consultation of the two *Sahīhs* and other authoritative books, [it will be seen that] the course open to the student who wants to act on these ḥadīth or cite them as a proof – if he is one of those permitted to act on ḥadīth and cite them as proofs to a partisan – is to consult a copy of the text (*asl*) which he personally or some other reliable person has collated against numerous sound copies transmitted through several different channels. So through the collation, in conjunction with the ubiquity of these books and the improbability that they were intentionally changed or corrupted, he obtains confidence in the soundness of what those texts agree upon. God knows best what is correct.

---

65 This is a reference to Dāraqutnī's *Kitāb al-Tatabbū'* (published with *al-Ilzāmāt*, Medina, 1397/1978).

## Category 2

### FAIR ḤADĪTH

(*Ma‘rifat al-ḥasan min al-ḥadīth*)

---

After relating that ḥadīth, according to the scholars of this discipline, fall into the three divisions we mentioned above, we heard that Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī<sup>1</sup> (God bless him) said, “‘Fair’ is the ḥadīth, the source<sup>2</sup> of which is known and the transmitters of which are famous. Most ḥadīth fall into this category and it is the category which most scholars accept and the generality of jurists employ.”<sup>3</sup> We heard that what Abū ʿIsā al-Tirmidhi (God be pleased with him) meant by “fair” is “that no one in the isnād of the ḥadīth is accused of falsehood, that it is not an anomalous ḥadīth (*ḥadīth shādhah*) and that something similar to it is related from more than one line of transmission.”<sup>4</sup> One of the more recent experts<sup>5</sup> said, “‘Fair’ is the ḥadīth in which there is a slight but tolerable weakness. It is suitable for use.”<sup>6</sup> All of this is ambiguous and inadequate. Nothing in the definitions of Tirmidhi and Khaṭṭābī distinguishes the fair ḥadīth from the sound. I have examined and researched the question of the fair ḥadīth at length, collecting the scattered remarks of the experts and taking note of the instances of their usage of this term. It became abundantly clear that there are two subcategories of fair ḥadīth.

1 Although the works of Abū Sulaymān Ḥamad b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭṭābī (296/908–386/996) were extremely influential, his life is poorly documented. He was the first to write commentaries on the major ḥadīth collections. His *Ma‘ālim al-Sunan* (ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Tabbākh, 4 vols, Aleppo, 1351/1932–1352/1934) deals with the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī while *A‘lām al-sunan* (ed. Yūsuf al-Kattānī, 2 vols, Rabat, n.d.) treats Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*; *EF*, 4:1131–2; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:210–11.

2 The word “*makhraj*” is not a technical term in the study of ḥadīth and on its own yielded very little meaning to later commentators. They tended to interpret the clause “the source of which is known” as a reference to the necessity of cohesion in the isnād of the fair ḥadīth, seemingly because that would otherwise be missing from Khaṭṭābī’s definition; e.g. Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughith*, 1:62–3; Zayn al-Dīn al-IRQI, *al-Taqyid wa-l-idāh*, ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān (Cairo, 1389/1969), 44; Zakariyā al-Anṣārī, *Fath al-Bāqī ‘alā Alfiyat al-IRQI* (bound with IRQI, *al-Tabṣira wa-l-tadhkira*), ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-IRQI al-Ḥusaynī, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 1:84.

3 *Ma‘ālim al-Sunan*, 1:6.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Tirmidhi* (*bi-sharḥ al-imām Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī*), 13 vols (Cairo, 1350/1931–1352/1934), 13:333–4.

5 *Ba‘d al-muta‘akhhirin*: although the division between the *mutaqaddimūn* and the *muta‘akhhirūn*, “the ancients and the moderns,” would seem by its nature to be relative and approximate, it is perhaps instructive to note that Dhahabi (d. 748/1374) made the year 300/912 the dividing line; *Mizān al-īstidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*, ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī, 4 vols (Cairo, 1382/1963), 1:4; id., *al-Mughnī fī l-du‘afā’*, ed. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Itr, 2 vols (Aleppo, 1391/1971), 1:4; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān al-mizān*, 6 vols (Hyderabad, 1329–31), 1:8–9, 5:396.

6 Abū ‘l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī wrote this in his *Kitāb al-Manqū‘āt*, ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad ‘Uthmān, 3 vols (Medina, 1387/1966–1388/1968), 1:35.

1. The ḥadīth the isnād of which includes an outwardly acceptable individual<sup>7</sup> whose suitability has not been confirmed: yet, this individual is not careless, prone to mistakes in what he transmits nor accused of falsehood in ḥadīth; that is, he manifests neither the practice of deliberately lying in ḥadīth nor any other reason for vitiating his integrity. In addition, it has become known that a text like that of the ḥadīth or one similar to it has been transmitted through one or more different lines of transmission. In this way, the ḥadīth is reinforced by the parallelism of someone else being in conformity with its transmitter with something like it or by another attestation to it; that is, the appearance of another ḥadīth with a similar text. This way the possibility that it is anomalous or unfamiliar (*munkar*) is excluded. The remarks of Tirmidhi concern this subcategory of fair ḥadīth.
  
2. The ḥadīth the transmitter of which is someone famous for veracity and honesty who, however, did not attain the grade of the transmitters of sound ḥadīth, because he fell short of them in retention and exactitude: despite that, his state is superior to that of the transmitter whose ḥadīth are counted as unfamiliar, if he is alone in transmitting them. For all of this, the ḥadīth must [first] be considered to be secure from being defective (*mu‘alla*), as well as secure from being anomalous or unfamiliar. The remarks of Khaṭṭābi concern the second subcategory of fair ḥadīth.

What we have said brings together the scattered comments of those whose remarks on the fair ḥadīth have come to our attention. It is as if Tirmidhi had mentioned one of the two categories of the fair ḥadīth and Khaṭṭābi had mentioned the other, each of them limiting himself to what he regarded as problematic and passing over what he saw as unproblematic, or paying no attention to some aspects of it, overlooking them. (God knows best.) The preceding was an enumeration of the principal aspects of the fair ḥadīth and we will now clarify the matter through a discussion of certain points worth noting and certain subsidiary issues.

1. The fair ḥadīth falls short of the sound in that the standard of the sound requires that the integrity, accuracy and exactitude of all of the transmitters of the sound ḥadīth be established, either by explicit transmission or by way of general acknowledgement, as we will explain, God (He is exalted) willing. That is not stipulated for the fair ḥadīth. As stated above, the appearance of the ḥadīth from several paths of transmission and the other conditions which were explained earlier do suffice in the case of the fair ḥadīth.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Mastūr* literally means “veiled” and may be translated as “respectable.” Ibn Ḥajar equated *mastūr* with *majhūl al-ḥāl*; *Nukhbat al-naẓar*, 87.

Whenever a Shāfi‘ite jurist regards that with skepticism, we remind him of the provision of Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) concerning the loose ḥadīth (*marāṣil*) of the Followers: that he accepted a loose ḥadīth for which there was a similar supported version (*musnād*). Likewise, he accepted a loose ḥadīth if another loose ḥadīth transmitted by someone who had not studied with the teachers of the first Follower was in agreement with it. Shāfi‘ī said this in some of his remarks where he speaks of several ways of determining the soundness of the source of a loose ḥadīth on the basis of its coming from another line of transmission. We also remind the skeptical Shāfi‘ite that Abu ‘l-Muzaffar al-Sam‘ānī<sup>8</sup> and others related from one of the students of Shāfi‘ī that the transmission of an outwardly acceptable transmitter is to be accepted, even if the testimony of an outwardly acceptable individual may not be accepted in court, and there is a cogent reason for that. So how [could a Shāfi‘ite object], when for a ḥadīth to be considered fair *we* would not be satisfied – in accordance with the foregoing remarks – by its mere relation by an outwardly acceptable individual? God knows best.

2. Perhaps some clever investigator will say, “We find ḥadīth judged as weak, despite their having been related with many isnāds through numerous lines of transmission, like the ḥadīth, ‘The ears are part of the head,’ and similar ones. Why do you not include that ḥadīth and the others like it in the category of fair ḥadīth, because the various versions reinforce one another, in the fashion you previously described regarding fair ḥadīth?” The answer to this is that not every weakness in a ḥadīth is eliminated by the ḥadīth coming from several lines of transmission. Rather, the situation varies. One weakness which the passage of a ḥadīth through several lines of transmission eliminates is the weakness which arises from some deficiency in the retention of its transmitter, when he is otherwise veracious and pious. When we see that the ḥadīth he related also comes from another line of transmission, we realize that it is one of the ḥadīth that he had retained properly and his accuracy in it was not impaired. Likewise, when the weakness of the ḥadīth is on account of looseness (*irsāl*), it disappears because of something along these lines – as in the case of the loose ḥadīth which an expert authority transmits as loose – since it contains just a small weakness which disappears through its relation from another line of transmission. There are also types of weakness which are not eliminated by something similar to that, on account of the severity of the weakness and the failure of this “bone-setter” to reduce the fracture in it and mend it. An example of this is the weakness which arises from the transmitter being accused of falsehood or from the ḥadīth being anomalous. This is an outline, the particulars of which are acquired through practice and study. So be aware of that. It is one of the fine points. God knows best.

---

<sup>8</sup> Abu ‘l-Muzaffar Mansūr b. Muḥammad al-Sam‘ānī (426/1035–489/1096) was the grandfather of Ibn al-Şalāh’s teacher Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:524, *Suppl.*, 1:731.

3. If the transmitter of a ḥadīth lags behind the grade of those who are retentive and exact – yet is widely known for veracity and respectability – and in addition to that his ḥadīth was related through more than one line of transmission, the strength of the ḥadīth is reinforced from both sides and that lifts his ḥadīth from the grade of fair to the grade of sound.

An instance of this is the ḥadīth of Muḥammad b. ‘Amr<sup>9</sup> from Abū Salama<sup>10</sup> from Abū Hurayra that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Were it not that I would be imposing a burden on my Community, I would have ordered them to clean their teeth with a tooth-stick before every prayer.” Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. ‘Alqama was renowned for veracity and piety, but he lacked exactitude. So some regarded him as weak on account of his poor retention while others deemed him reliable because of his veracity and augustness. Thus his ḥadīth from this standpoint is only fair. When the circumstance that the ḥadīth is related through other lines of transmission was combined with that, our fears about his poor retention vanished and that slight shortcoming was mended. So this isnād was established as sound and the ḥadīth attained the level of the sound ḥadīth. God knows best.

4. The book of Abū Ḫaṣan al-Tirmidhī (God bless him) is a fundamental document for the recognition of fair ḥadīth. He is the one who referred to this category of ḥadīth by this name and he used the term often in his *Jāmi‘*. The term “fair” is also scattered throughout the remarks of some of his teachers and the members of the generation of scholars before him, like Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Bukhārī and others.

The various copies of Tirmidhī’s book differ in his designations, “This is a fair ḥadīth,” or “This is a fair and sound ḥadīth (*ḥadīth ḥasan ṣahīḥ*)”, and the like. So it is best that you correct your copy of it against a batch of other copies and rely on what they agree upon.

Dāraqutnī in his *Sunan* explicitly designates many of his ḥadīth as fair and this designation also occurs often in the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (God bless him). We heard that he said, “I mentioned in my *Sunan* the sound ḥadīth and those similar and close to them.” We also heard his remarks to the effect that he mentions for each topic the soundest ḥadīth known to him. He said, “I have indicated those ḥadīth in my book that contain a severe debility. The ḥadīth I do not say anything about are good (*sāliḥ*), and some are sounder than others.”<sup>11</sup> On

9 Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. ‘Alqama al-Laythī (d. ca. 145/762) was best known as the principal transmitter from Abū Salama; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:136–7.

10 Abū Salama ‘Abd Allāh (or Ismā‘il) b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Qurashi (ca. 20/641–94/713) was a Medinese expert in ḥadīth and law; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:287–92.

11 *Risālat Abī Dāwūd ilā ahl Makka fi waṣf Sunanīhi*, ed. Muḥammad b. Luṭfi al-Ṣabbāgh, 3rd edn. (Beirut, 1405), 27–8.

this basis, the ḥadīth which we find mentioned in his book without any designation – if they are not in either of the two *Sahīhs* and no scholar who discriminates between the sound and the fair designates them as sound – we know to be fair in the opinion of Abū Dāwūd, although some of them may not be fair in the opinion of others and may not be included in the material which we have established the accuracy of calling “fair” in accordance with what has been said above. This is because – when the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda<sup>12</sup> related that he heard Muḥammad b. Sa‘d al-Bāwardī<sup>13</sup> saying in Egypt, “It was Abū ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān al-Nasā’ī’s way to include the ḥadīth of all of those transmitters who were not unanimously rejected,” – Ibn Manda himself added, “Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī as well adopts the same course, including ḥadīth having weak isnāds if he does not find anything else on the topic, because in his view they were stronger than the arbitrary opinions (*ra'y*) of men.” God knows best.

5. The author of the *Maṣābiḥ* (*Lamps*)<sup>14</sup> (God bless him) came to divide his ḥadīth into two categories, the sound and the fair. By “sound” he meant the ḥadīth appearing in one or both of the *Sahīhs* and by “fair” the ḥadīth Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijistānī], Tirmidhī and their peers included in their compilations. This is a usage unrecognized by others. The scholars of ḥadīth do not consider the fair ḥadīth to consist of that, for these books [that is, those of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Tirmidhī, and so forth] contain fair and other ḥadīth, as has been made clear. God knows best.

6. The *musnads* – like those of Abū Dāwūd al-Tayālīsī,<sup>15</sup> ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā,<sup>16</sup> Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal,<sup>17</sup> Iṣhāq b. Rāhawayh,<sup>18</sup> ‘Abd b. Ḥumayd,<sup>19</sup>

12 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Iṣhāq b. Manda (310/922–395/1005) was the author of several religious works; *EP*, 3:863.

13 Some have identified this Muḥammad b. Sa‘d al-Bāwardī as the Abū Manṣūr al-Bāwardī who is mentioned as an author of a work on the Companions by Ibn Ḥajar, *al-İṣāba fi tamyiz al-Sahāba*, 4 vols (Cairo, 1328), 1:3 and Sakhāwi, *Iklān*, 161; see, for example, Kattānī, *Risāla*, 128.

14 Baghawī was the author of the collection of ḥadīth without isnāds entitled *Maṣābiḥ al-sunna* (ed. Ibrāhīm Muḥammad Ramādān, 2 vols, Beirut, n.d.). Despite Baghawī’s unique views (presented in the very brief introduction to the work), *Maṣābiḥ* was very popular and spawned considerable activity among later scholars; see Ḥāfiẓ Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:cols 1698–702.

15 Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Dāwūd b. al-Jārūd al-Tayālīsī (133/750–203/818 or 204) was a famous ḥadīth scholar in al-Baṣra; *EP*, 4:708; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:97–8.

16 Abū Muḥammad ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā al-‘Absī (d. 213/829 or 214) is said to have been the first scholar in al-Baṣra to compose a *musnad*; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:553–7.

17 The very large *musnad* ascribed to Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was published in six volumes (Cairo, 1311–13).

18 *Musnad Iṣhāq ibn Rāhawayh*, ed. ‘Abd al-Ghafūr ‘Abd al-Haqq Ḥusayn Barr al-Balūshī (Medina, 1410/1990).

19 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd (or ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd) b. Ḥumayd al-Kashshī (or al-Kishshī) was a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 249/863. His *Musnad* has survived in the form

Dārimī,<sup>20</sup> Abū Yaqṣā al-Mawṣilī,<sup>21</sup> al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān,<sup>22</sup> Abū Bakr al-Bazzār<sup>23</sup> and similar works – do not reach the level of the Five Books – that is, the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, the *Sunan* of Nasā'ī, the *Jāmi'* of Tirmidhī – and works similar to them in that the ḥadīth appearing in them are suitable for citation as proofs in arguments and for being relied upon, unless they are designated otherwise. The custom of the compilers of the *musnads* was to include in the chapter (*musnad*) of each Companion all of his ḥadīth they related, without restricting themselves to the ḥadīth worthy of being cited as proofs. For this reason, the level of these *musnads* fell below the level of the Five Books, even if these *musnads* are highly esteemed on account of the augustness of their compilers. This is also true of the works arranged by subject based on these *musnads*. God knows best.

7. The statement of scholars, “This is a ḥadīth sound from the standpoint of its isnād (*ṣaḥīḥ al-isnād*)” – or “fair from the standpoint of its isnād (*ḥasan al-isnād*),” – is less than their saying, “This is a sound ḥadīth” – or “a fair ḥadīth” – because sometimes it is said, “This is a ḥadīth sound from the standpoint of its isnād,” and the ḥadīth is not actually sound on account of being anomalous or defective. However, when a reliable author says nothing more than that it is sound from the standpoint of its isnād and he does not go on to bring up a defect in it or impugn it, the presumption from this is that he judged it to be intrinsically sound (*ṣaḥīḥ fi nafsīhi*) because the lack of a defect or reason for impugnment is what is initially presumed. God knows best.

8. The statement of Tirmidhī and others, “This is a fair and sound ḥadīth” (*ḥadīth ḥasan ᷣaḥīḥ*) is problematic because the fair ḥadīth is inferior to the sound, as was explained above. The conjunction of these two states in a single ḥadīth is the conjunction of the negation and assertion of this inferiority. The answer here is that the expression concerns the isnād. When a single ḥadīth is

of *al-Muntakhab min Musnad 'Abd ibn Humayd* (ed. Subḥīt al-Badrī al-Sāmarrā'ī and Maḥmūd Muḥammad Khaltī al-Šā'idi, Beirut, 1408/1988); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:113.

- 20 Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Dārimī was born in 181/797 and died in 255/869. His *Musnad* – in which the ḥadīth are arranged by subject – has been published as *Sunan al-Dārimī* (ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duḥmān, 2 vols, Damascus, 1349); *EP*, 2:159; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:114–15.
- 21 Abū Yaqṣā Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. al-Muthannā al-Mawṣilī (210/826–307/919) was esteemed because, among other things, he taught his *Musnad* (ed. Ḥusayn Salim Asad, 14 vols, Damascus, 1404/1984–1410/1990) for the sake of God rather than for worldly gain as others did (e.g., al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:170–71.
- 22 Abu 'l-'Abbas al-Ḥasan b. Sufyān al-Nasawī was born around 213/828 and died in 303/916; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:169–70. Ḥajjī Khalfā mentions his *musnad* in *Kaṣf*, 2:col. 1682.
- 23 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Amr al-Bazzār died in 292/905. His *musnad* has been published as *al-Bahr al-zakhkhār* (ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zayn Allāh, Medina, 1416/1996, only vol. 8 seen); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:162.

related with two isnāds, one of them fair and the other sound, it may properly be called a “fair and sound ḥadīth;” that is, it is fair in relation to one isnād and sound in relation to the other. However, it is not unheard of for someone to use that expression, meaning “fair” in its everyday sense – that is, what the soul inclines toward and the heart does not reject [that is, in the sense of “beautiful”] – rather than the technical meaning with which we are concerned, so be aware of that. God knows best.

9. There are some scholars of ḥadīth who do not recognize fair ḥadīth as a separate category, subsuming them in the types of sound ḥadīth, since they are included in the types of ḥadīth which may be adduced as proofs. The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakim’s adherence to this doctrine is apparent from his remarks in his *Taṣarrufāt* and he indicates it also by calling the book of Tirmidhī the *al-Ǧāmi‘ al-ṣahīḥ* (*The Comprehensive Collection of Sound Hadith*). The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb<sup>24</sup> also applied the name of “*Sahīḥ*” without any qualification to Tirmidhī’s book and to the book of Nasā’ī. The expert Abū Tāhir al-Silaftī<sup>25</sup> brought up the Five Books and said, “The scholars of the East and the West agree upon the soundness of them.” This is an instance of careless speech, for the authors of these books have clearly designated some of the ḥadīth they contain as being “weak” (*da‘īf*), “unfamiliar” and other similar terms descriptive of weak ḥadīth. Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijistānī] in the passage we quoted above clearly indicated the division of the ḥadīth in his book into sound and other kinds of ḥadīth and Tirmidhī clearly distinguishes between the sound and the fair ḥadīth in his book. If someone who does not deny that the fair ḥadīth is inferior to the sound as described above calls a fair ḥadīth “sound,” it is merely a case of a difference in expression rather than in sense. God knows best.

<sup>24</sup> Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. ‘Alī b. Thābit (392/1002–463/1071), popularly known as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, was one of the towering figures of traditional Islamic scholarship and his *Ta’rīkh Baghḍād* (14 vols, Cairo, 1349/1931) is the finest classical biographical dictionary. Several of his other important contributions to the study of ḥadīth will be mentioned in the course of this present work; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:400–401, *Suppl.*, 1:562–4; *EP*, 4:1111–12.

<sup>25</sup> Abū Tāhir Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Silaftī was born around 472/1078 in Nishapur. After extensive travels, he settled in Alexandria in 511/1117, where he remained almost continuously until his death in 576/1180. During his lifetime he was the most important scholar of ḥadīth in the western Islamic world; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:450, *Suppl.*, 1:624; *EP*, 9:607–9.

### Category 3

#### WEAK ḤADĪTH

*(Ma‘rifat al-da‘if min al-ḥadīth)*

---

Every ḥadīth in which the traits of the sound ḥadīth and the fair ḥadīth mentioned above do not come together is a “weak” ḥadīth. Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī went overboard in creating subcategories of weak ḥadīth, coming up with forty-nine. What I gave here is a general rule for all of that.

The procedure for someone who seeks to expound at length on this topic is to take a particular trait of the sound or the fair ḥadīth and make the ḥadīth that lack that trait a separate subcategory of weak ḥadīth – if there is nothing mitigating the absence of the trait in the fashion established in the Category of the fair ḥadīth. He then should make the ḥadīth that lack that trait in addition to another particular trait a second subcategory. Then he should make the ḥadīth that lack that trait in addition to two other particular traits a third subcategory. He should continue in this fashion until he covers all of the aforementioned traits. Then he should go back and pick anew a trait other than the one he initially picked and make the ḥadīth that lack it alone a subcategory. Another subcategory is comprised of the ḥadīth that lack the new trait and another trait – and let the latter trait be different from the one he began with because it was already used in the subdivisions based on the lack of that first trait – and so on to the last of the traits. The last and lowest subcategory is composed of the ḥadīth that lack all of the traits. For the traits that have special stipulations (*shurūt*) do the same thing with their stipulations so that the subcategories are thereby further multiplied.

The subcategories of the weak ḥadīth which have well-known special appellations are the “forged” (*maṣḍū‘*), the “mixed-up” (*maqlūb*), the “anomalous” (*shādhah*), the “defective” (*mu‘alla*), the “disrupted” (*muqṭarib*), the “loose” (*mursal*), the “interrupted” (*munqaṭi‘*) and the “problematic” (*mu‘dal*). The explanation of these will appear in later chapters, God (He is exalted) willing. It will be noted in the Categories we will be presenting that they are general Categories of the Sciences of Ḥadīth and not specifically Categories of the original system of classification,<sup>1</sup> which we have now completed. We beseech God (He is blessed and exalted) to make all-encompassing the benefit of this book both in this world and in the hereafter. Amen!

---

1 That is, the division of ḥadīth into sound, fair and weak; see Ibn Hajar, *Nukat*, 1:504.

Category 4  
SUPPORTED ḤADĪTH  
(*Ma‘rifat al-musnad*)

---

The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (God bless him) stated that the scholars of ḥadīth hold the supported ḥadīth to be the one with an isnād which coheres from the person transmitting it up to its point of termination. Most often the term is applied to the ḥadīth which came from the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him), rather than the ḥadīth which originated with the Companions and others.<sup>1</sup> The expert Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr<sup>2</sup> stated that supported ḥadīth are exclusively those “raised” (*rūfi‘a*) to the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The isnād may be uninterrupted (*muttaṣil*) – like Mālik from Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)<sup>3</sup> – or it may be interrupted (*munqati‘*) – like Mālik from Zuhri from Ibn ‘Abbās from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).<sup>4</sup> The second ḥadīth is supported since its isnād goes to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and it is interrupted because Zuhri did not hear ḥadīth from Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them). Abū ‘Umar related from several scholars the view that the term “supported” applies only to the ḥadīth with an uninterrupted isnād raised to the Prophet (Peace be upon him).<sup>5</sup> The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim (God bless him) stated that unambiguously and did not mention any other definition in his book.<sup>6</sup> These are three differing interpretations. The first opinion is the most balanced and appropriate. God knows best.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Al-Kifāya fi ‘ilm al-riwāya* (Hyderabad, 1357), 21.

<sup>2</sup> Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Namārī al-Qurṭubī (368/978–463/1071) was a Andalusian Mālikite who wrote extensively on subjects related to the study of ḥadīth. His *Tamhid*, a commentary on the *Muwaṭṭa‘* of Mālik, may be his most important contribution to ḥadīth scholarship and Ibn al-Šalāḥ cited it often; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:453–4, *Suppl.*, 1:628–9; *EP*, 3:674.

<sup>3</sup> *Al-Tamhid li-mā fi ‘l-Muwaṭṭa‘ min al-ma‘āni wa-‘l-asānid* (ed. Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad al-‘Alawī and Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Bakrī ([Rabat], 1967/1387 ff.), 1:21.

<sup>4</sup> *Tamhid*, 1:23.

<sup>5</sup> *Tamhid*, 1:25.

<sup>6</sup> *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 17–19.

Category 5  
UNINTERRUPTED ḤADĪTH  
*(Ma‘rifat al-muttaṣil)*

---

The uninterrupted ḥadīth is also called “connected” (*mawṣūl*). The term, when used without qualification, may be applied to both raised (*marfū‘*) and halted ḥadīth (*mawqūf*). It is the ḥadīth with an isnād which is uninterrupted because each of its transmitters heard the ḥadīth from the person above him up to its point of termination. An example of a raised uninterrupted ḥadīth from the *Muwattā'* is “Mālik from Ibn Shihāb [al-Zuhri] from Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh from his father [that is, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar] from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).” An example of a halted uninterrupted ḥadīth is “Mālik from Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar from ‘Umar:<sup>1</sup> ‘Umar said ...” God knows best.

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb was a close associate of the Prophet Muḥammad and served as caliph from 13/634 until his assassination in 23/644; *EI*, 3:982–4.

**Category 6**  
**RAISED ḤADITH**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-marfū‘)*

---

The term “raised” applies exclusively to the ḥadīth attributed to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and it does not apply, when used without qualification, to anything else, just as the term “halted” (*mawqūf*) is applied to the Companions and others [and not to the ḥadīth of the Prophet]. The raised ḥadīth may be uninterrupted (*muttaṣil*), interrupted (*munqaṭi‘*), loose (*mursal*) and the like. Some people regard the raised ḥadīth and the supported (*musnad*) as being the same, arguing that both may be either interrupted or uninterrupted. Others maintain that they differ in that a raised ḥadīth may be either interrupted or uninterrupted while the term “supported” applies only to the uninterrupted ḥadīth attributed to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The expert Abū Bakr b. Thābit [al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī] said, “The raised ḥadīth is the one in which a Companion gives information about the words or deeds of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).”<sup>1</sup> He restricted the term to the transmission of the Companions and thus the loose ḥadīth of the Followers (*mursal al-Tābi‘i*) from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) were excluded. The scholars of ḥadīth who contrasted the raised ḥadīth with the loose meant “uninterrupted” when they said “raised.” God knows best.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Kifāya*, 21.

## Category 7

### HALTED ḤADĪTH

*(Ma'rifat al-mawqūf)*

---

The halted ḥadīth is the one which is transmitted from the Companions (God be pleased with them) concerning their words, deeds and the like and which is stopped at them and is not carried past to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). If its isnād is cohesive to the Companion, it is called “connected halted” (*al-mawqūf al-mawṣūl*); and, if its isnād is not cohesive, it is called “unconnected halted” (*al-mawqūf ghayr al-mawṣūl*). This is similar to what is known to pertain to the ḥadīth raised (*marfū'*) to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). (God knows best.) If the term “halted” is used without any qualification, it refers exclusively, as we mentioned above, to a ḥadīth of a Companion. The term is sometimes used with qualification for transmitters who were not Companions. It is said, “X halted (*waqafa*) such-and-such ḥadīth at ‘Aṭā<sup>1</sup>” – or “Tāwūs<sup>2</sup>” or someone similar. In the terminology of the Khurāsānian jurists, we find that the halted ḥadīth is identified with the term “account” (*athar*). One of them, Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Fūrānī,<sup>3</sup> said in something of his we read, “The jurists say a ‘report’ (*khabar*) is what is related from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and an ‘account’ is what is related from the Companions (God be pleased with them).”

---

1 Abū Muḥammad ‘Aṭā<sup>b</sup> b. Abī al-Rabāḥ Aslam (27/647–114/732) was the student of a large number of Companions; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:31.

2 Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Tāwūs b. Kaysān (d. 106/724), like ‘Aṭā<sup>b</sup>, was a prominent transmitter from the second generation of Muslims; Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 5:38–49.

3 The Shāfi'iite jurist Abū 'l-Qasim 'Abd al-Rahmān<sup>b</sup> b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Fūrān al-Marwāzī died at an advanced age in 461/1069; Dhahabī, *Sīyar*, 18:264–5.

**Category 8**  
**CUT-OFF ḤADĪTH**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-maqṭū‘)*

---

The cut-off ḥadīth is not the same as the interrupted (*munqāṭī‘*) which, God (He is exalted) willing, will be discussed later. *Maqṭū‘* and *maqāṭī‘* are given as the plurals of *maqṭū‘*. The cut-off ḥadīth is a report concerning the words and deeds of the Followers, halted at them. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said about the cut-off ḥadīth in his *Jāmi‘*,<sup>1</sup> “The Cut-off Ḥadīth: the cut-off ḥadīth are those halted at the Followers.” I have also found the cut-off ḥadīth interpreted as interrupted – that is, unconnected (*ghayr mawṣūl*) – in the remarks of the imām Shāfi‘ī, Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Tabarānī<sup>2</sup> and others. God knows best.

#### Subsidiary Issues

1. The statement of a Companion, “We used to do such and such,” or “We used to say such and such,” falls into the category of halted ḥadīth, if he does not ascribe it to the time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). If he does ascribe it to the time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), it belongs to the category of raised ḥadīth (*marfū‘*), as the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Bayyī‘ [al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūri],<sup>3</sup> other scholars of ḥadīth and others have unequivocally stated. I read that Abū Bakr al-Barqānī asked the authority Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī about that and he denied that it constitutes a raised ḥadīth. The claim that it is raised deserves credit since the obvious implication of [the statement that they used to say or do something during the lifetime of the Prophet] is that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) took cognizance of [what his Companions were saying or doing] and tacitly assented to it, and his tacit assent is one of the forms of raised *sunna*.<sup>4</sup> The categories of raised *sunna* include the words of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), his deeds, and his tacit assent to and forbearance from rejecting [the statements and actions of his Companions] after becoming cognizant of them. Examples of this last kind of raised *sunna* are the statements of a Companion, “We did not use to think that there was anything wrong with such and such while the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was among us,” “Such and such used to be said during the Prophet’s lifetime,” or, “They used to do such and such during the life of the

---

1 *Jāmi‘*, 356.

2 Abu ‘l-Qāsim Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Tabarānī (260/873–360/971) was the author of a number of important works on ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:195–7.

3 *Ulöüm al-ḥadīth*, 22.

4 A *sunna* is a practice endorsed by the precedent of an authoritative figure.

Prophet (Peace be upon him)." All of these, and similar declarations, are considered supported raised ḥadīth (*marṣūf musnad*) and are included in the books of supported ḥadīth.

In regard to the report we heard from al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba,<sup>5</sup> "The Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to tap on his door with their fingernails," Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim stated, "Those who are not versed in this craft mistakenly believe that this ḥadīth is supported"—that is, raised—"on account of the mention of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in it. It is not supported, but rather halted (*mawqūf*)."<sup>6</sup> Al-Khaṭīb said something similar to this in his *Jāmi‘*<sup>7</sup> as well. Rather, it is, as stated above, raised. It is more appropriate that it be termed "raised" since it is more probable that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) was cognizant of the act described, and al-Hākim acknowledges that as constituting raised. We used to count this as one of the things we held against al-Hākim. Then we interpreted it, giving him the benefit of the doubt, to mean that he meant that this ḥadīth is not explicitly supported, but rather it is literally halted, just as the rest of [the examples discussed] earlier were literally halted. We made it raised only on the basis of its sense. God knows best.

2. The scholars of ḥadīth view a Companion's statement, "We were enjoined to do such and such," or, "We were forbidden to do such and such," as belonging to the category of the raised and the supported ḥadīth. Indeed, this is the doctrine of most scholars. A certain group including Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī disputed that. The first view is the correct one because such statements, when unqualified, by presumption go back to the one who possesses the right to enjoin and forbid and he is the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The same is true of the statement of a Companion, "Such and such is a *sunna*." The sounder opinion is that this statement is a raised supported ḥadīth, because the presumption is that the Companion means by this expression only the *sunna* of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and following him is what is required. This is also true of the statement of Anas<sup>8</sup> (God be pleased with him), "Bilal" was ordered to say the words of the call to prayer twice and the words of the *iqāma* once," and other

5 The prominent Companion Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba al-Thaqafī served as the governor of al-Baṣrà and al-Kūfa under the early caliphs and died of the plague in the year 50/670 at around the age of seventy; *EF*, 7:347.

6 *‘Ulūm al-hadīth*, 19.

7 *Jāmi‘*, 355.

8 Abū Hamza Anas b. Malik al-Anṣārī was one of the last Companions of the Prophet to die and a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth. He died in al-Baṣrà around the year 93/712—the exact date is disputed—at over one hundred years of age; *EF*, 1:482.

9 The renowned Companion Bilāl b. Rabāḥ (d. ca. 20/641), who was also known by his mother's name as Bilāl b. Hamāma, served as a muezzin during the lifetime of the Prophet; *EF*, 1:1215.

analogous statements. So there is no difference between Anas saying that in the time of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) or after him (Peace be upon him). God knows best.

3. The assertion that the commentary (*tafsīr*) of a Companion constitutes a supported ḥadīth holds true only in the case of a Companion giving an interpretation concerning the circumstance of the revelation of a verse of the Qurān and the like. For instance, the statement of Jābir<sup>10</sup> (God be pleased with him), “The Jews used to say that the child of someone who has vaginal intercourse with his wife from the rear will be born squint-eyed. Then God (He is mighty and majestic) revealed the Qurānic verse [2:223], ‘Your women are a field for you ...’” The other interpretations of the Companions which do not contain the ascription of anything to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) are counted as halted ḥadīth. God knows best.

4. The ḥadīth in the isnāds of which it is said at the mention of the Companion, “He raises the ḥadīth” (*yarfa‘u*), “He reaches with it” (*yablughu bihi*), “He advances it” (*yanmīhi*) or “As a transmission” (*riwāyatan*) are considered raised ḥadīth. An example of this is “Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna” from Abū ‘l-Zinād<sup>11</sup> from al-A‘raj<sup>12</sup> from Abū Hurayra as a transmission, “[The Hour will not come until] you fight a people with small eyes ...,” and with the same isnād, “from Abū Hurayra, he reaches with it, ‘The people are subordinates of the Quraysh ...’” All of these expressions and others like them allude to the Companion raising the ḥadīth to the level of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and scholars judge them to be plainly raised. When a transmitter says about a Follower, “He raises the ḥadīth,” or “He reaches with it,” that is also raised, but it is a loose raised ḥadīth (*marfū‘ mursal*). God knows best.

<sup>10</sup> The Companion Abū ‘Abd Allah Jābir b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Amr al-Salāmī al-Anṣārī (d. 78/697) was the *muftī* in Medina after the Prophet’s death. His ḥadīth were collected in an early *sahīfa* (see Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:85); Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:189–94.

<sup>11</sup> The great scholar of ḥadīth Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna was born in al-Kūfa in 107/725 and died in Mecca in 196/811; *EF*, 9:772; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:96.

<sup>12</sup> Abū ‘l-Zinād ‘Abd Allah b. Dhakwān al-Qurashī (ca. 65/684–130/748) lived in Medina and was an expert in ḥadīth, law and the Arabic language; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:405.

<sup>13</sup> Abū Dawūd ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Hurmuz al-Hāshimī, known as “al-A‘raj,” was an expert in a number of disciplines. He died in 117/735 at an advanced age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:69–70.

## Category 9

### LOOSE HADITH

*(Ma‘rifat al-mursal)*

---

The form of the loose ḥadīth about which there is no disagreement is the ḥadīth of an early Follower (*al-Ṭābi‘i al-kabir*) – like ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Adī b. al-Khayyār,<sup>1</sup> Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib<sup>2</sup> and those like them who met a number of the Companions and attended their classes – when he says, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said.” The common view is that all of the Followers (God be pleased with them) are to be treated equally in that regard.

There are also other forms regarding which there is disagreement as to whether they are really loose or not.

1. When an isnād is interrupted before reaching the Follower because it contains the relation of a transmitter who did not hear ḥadīth from the individual mentioned above him: the authority Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim<sup>3</sup> and some other scholars of ḥadīth said definitively that this kind of ḥadīth is not to be called “loose” and that looseness (*irsāl*) appertains exclusively to the Followers. Rather, they maintain that if the mention of a single transmitter is omitted before it reaches the Follower it may only be called “interrupted” (*munqati‘*) and that if more than one transmitter is omitted it is called “problematic” (*mu‘dal*) – and the latter may also be termed “interrupted.” An example of that will be given further on, God (He is exalted) willing. It is well known that in the disciplines of positive and theoretical law all of these forms are called “loose.” The scholar of ḥadīth Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb subscribed to the latter view and gave definite statement to it. However, he did say, “Nevertheless, from the standpoint of usage most of the ḥadīth described as being ‘loose’ are those a Follower related directly about the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and they call the ḥadīth that a later individual (*tābi‘ al-Ṭābi‘i*) related directly from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ‘problematic.’”<sup>4</sup> God knows best.

2. When Zuhri, Abū Hāzim,<sup>5</sup> Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Anṣārī<sup>6</sup> and their colleagues among the later Followers (*aṣāghir al-Ṭābi‘in*) say, “The Messenger of God

---

1 ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Adī was a Medinese religious scholar who died around 91/710; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:514–15.

2 Abū Muhammad Sa‘īd b. al-Musayyib al-Makhzūmī (13/634–94/713) was an active figure in a number of religious disciplines; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:276.

3 ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 28.

4 *Kifāya*, 21.

5 Salama b. Dīnār al-Makhzūmī (d. ca. 140/757) was a judge in Medina; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:634–5.

6 Abū Sa‘īd Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd b. Qays al-Anṣārī was an early judge who died in 143/760; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:407.

(Peace be upon him) said:<sup>7</sup>” Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related that some people do not call this form “loose,” but rather “interrupted,” because these late Followers met only one or two of the Companions and most of their transmission of ḥadīth is from other Followers.<sup>8</sup> This view is derived from the doctrine of those who do not term as “loose” a ḥadīth interrupted before it reaches the level of the Follower. The common view, stated above, is that all of the Followers are to be treated equally in regard to the application of the term “loose.” God knows best.

3. When it is said in an isnād, “X from a man,” “From a teacher from X,” or the like: the view which al-Ḥākim stated in his book *Ma‘rifat ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth* (*The Sciences of Hadīth*) is that this form is not to be called “loose,” but rather “interrupted.”<sup>9</sup> In some of the well-respected works on theoretical law this is counted as one of the types of loose ḥadīth. God knows best.

Be aware that a loose ḥadīth is treated as if it were weak unless its source is established as sound by the relation of the text through another line of transmission, as was explained in the Category on fair ḥadīth. Thus Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) adduced as proofs loose ḥadīth from Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib (God be pleased with them), because supported versions of the same texts from other lines of transmission existed. As we have seen, this in his view did not exclusively apply to the loose ḥadīth of Ibn al-Musayyib. To whoever denies that, claiming that in this case the supported version of the ḥadīth is actually being relied upon rather than the loose and that the loose version is itself null and useless, the response is that the soundness of the isnād containing the looseness becomes apparent by virtue of the supported version. So even though the isnād is loose, it is judged to be a sound isnād which can support a proof, as we established in Category 2. Only someone devoid of experience in this matter can deny this.

The doctrine which the majority of the experts and critics of ḥadīth has settled on is, as was mentioned above, that a loose ḥadīth may not be cited as a proof and is judged to be weak. They repeat this doctrine often in their works and in the introduction of the *Sahīh* of Muslim we find the following: “The loose ḥadīth does not constitute a proof according to the principle of my doctrine and that of those knowledgeable about reports.”<sup>10</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr – the expert of the West – is one of those who transmitted that view from a group of the scholars of ḥadīth.<sup>11</sup> However, on the other side, the doctrine of Mālik and Abū Hanīfa<sup>12</sup> and their followers is that a loose ḥadīth may be adduced as a proof. God knows best.

<sup>7</sup> *Tamhid*, 1:22.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 27–8.

<sup>9</sup> *Al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 1:24. See also G.H.A. Juynboll, “Muslim’s Introduction to his *Sahīh*,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam*, 5(1984):296.

<sup>10</sup> *Tamhid*, 1:1–7.

<sup>11</sup> Abū Ḥanīfa al-Nu‘mān b. Thābit (d. ca.150/767) was the eponym of the Ḥanafite school of law; *EP*, 1:123–4; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:409–19; *EIr*, 1:295–301.

We do not count as a type of the loose ḥadīth and its analogues the ḥadīth which in legal theory is called “a loose ḥadīth of a Companion” (*mursal al-Sahābi*). Examples of this are the ḥadīth which Ibn ‘Abbās and the other young Companions relate directly from (*yarmihi ‘an*) the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) which they did not actually hear from him. That is because these ḥadīth are judged to be supported connected ḥadīth (*al-mawṣūl al-musnād*), since the young Companions related from other Companions. Ignorance of the identity of the specific Companion [from whom the younger Companion learned the ḥadīth] does not impugn the validity of the transmission because all of the Companions were upright (*‘udūl*). God knows best.

**Category 10**  
**INTERRUPTED ḤADĪTH**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-munqaṭī)*

---

The doctrines of the scholars of ḥadīth and others are in disagreement over the interrupted ḥadīth and over the difference between it and the loose ḥadīth (*mursaḥ*). One opinion is the view from al-Ḥākim – the author of the book *Ma‘rifat anwāt ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth* – that was already given in the Category on the loose ḥadīth to the effect that the term “loose” appertains exclusively to a Follower. In his view, one form of the interrupted is the isnād which contains, prior to reaching the level of the Follower, a transmitter who did not hear ḥadīth from the transmitter above him while no mention, either specific or vague, is made of the individual who is omitted from between the two transmitters. Another form of the interrupted is the isnād in which one of the transmitters is designated by a vague expression, like “a man,” “a teacher” or other similar things.<sup>1</sup>

An example of the first form is the ḥadīth we heard from ‘Abd al-Razzāq<sup>2</sup> from Sufyān al-Thawrī<sup>3</sup> from Abū Ishāq<sup>4</sup> from Zayd b. Yuthayf<sup>5</sup> from Hudhayfa.<sup>6</sup> “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘If you appoint Abū Bakr<sup>7</sup> as a leader, he is strong and honest ...’” When a ḥadīthologist (*hadīthī*) examines this isnād, he finds its outward form to be that of an uninterrupted ḥadīth (*muttaṣil*). Yet it is interrupted in two places, because ‘Abd al-Razzāq did not hear it directly from Thawrī. Rather he heard it from al-Nu‘mān b. Abī Shayba al-Janadī<sup>8</sup> from Thawrī.

---

1 ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 27–9.

2 Abū Bakr ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām al-Himyārī (126/744–211/827) was a famous ḥadīth scholar from the Yemen; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:99.

3 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Sufyān b. Sa‘īd al-Thawrī (ca. 95/713–161/778) was an extremely influential figure in a number of scholarly domains; *EP*, 9:770–72; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:518–19.

4 Abū Ishāq ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sabīq (32/653–128/746) was a resident of al-Kūfa famed for his piety and knowledge of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:283.

5 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4 vols in 8 parts (Hyderabad, 1361–5), 2(1):408–9; Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Kitāb al-Jarh wa-l-ta‘dil*, ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yahyā al-Mu‘allimī al-Yamānī, 4 vols in 8 parts (Hyderabad, 1371/1952–1373/1953), 1(2):573–4, nos 2598 and 2599.

6 The Companion Abū ‘Abd Allāh Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān (d. 35/656) served as the governor of al-Madā'in under the Caliphs ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān; Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 2:361–9.

7 Abū Bakr al-Siddīq (d. 13/634) was a close friend of the Prophet who had the distinction of accompanying him on his migration to Mecca. He was the father of the Prophet’s most famous wife ‘Ā’ishah and succeeded him as the leader of the Muslim community; *EP*, 1:109–11.

8 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(1):447–8.

Furthermore, Thawrī did not hear it from Abū Ishaq. He instead heard it from Sharik<sup>9</sup> from Abū Ishaq.

An example of the second form is the ḥadīth which we heard from Abu 'l-Ālā b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Shikhkhīr<sup>10</sup> from "two men" from Shaddād b. Aws<sup>11</sup> from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) about the invocation in the prayer ritual, "God, I ask for a firm resolve in the matter ..." God knows best.

Another interpretation of the interrupted ḥadīth is the statement of Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (God bless him) to the effect that the term "loose" appertains exclusively to the Followers and the term "interrupted" includes loose and other kinds [of ḥadīth with incohesive isnāds]. His view is that the interrupted ḥadīth is "everything with an incohesive isnād, whether it is ascribed to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or to someone else."<sup>12</sup>

Another opinion is that the interrupted ḥadīth is identical to the loose and both terms include everything that has an incohesive isnād. This view is the most likely. Various groups of jurists and others have adopted it and it is the view that the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb gave in his *Kifāya*.<sup>13</sup> However, most of the ḥadīth which are described in actual usage as "loose" are ḥadīth which a Follower related directly from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and most of the ḥadīth that are described as "interrupted" are ḥadīth which someone below the level of the Followers related directly from the Companions, for instance "Mālik from Ibn 'Umar" and the like. God knows best.

Another opinion is the one which Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related from a person knowledgeable in ḥadīth to the effect that the interrupted ḥadīth consists of an account of the words or deeds of a Follower or someone lower, halted at him.<sup>14</sup> This last interpretation is peculiar and far fetched. God knows best.

9 Abū 'Abd Allāh Sharik b. 'Abd Allāh al-Nakha'ī (95/714–177/794) was the *qāḍī* of al-Kūfa; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:200–16.

10 Abū 'l-Ālā Yazid b. 'Abd Allāh b. al-Shikhkhīr al-Baṣrī (d. ca. 110/728) was a well-respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:493–4.

11 The prominent Companion Shaddād b. Aws al-Anṣārī (d. 58/678) settled in Palestine; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:460–7.

12 *Tumhid*, 1:21.

13 *Kifāya*, 21.

14 *Kifāya*, 21.

Category 11  
PROBLEMATIC ḤADĪTH  
*(Ma‘rifat al-mu‘dal)*

---

“Problematic” is the name of a particular type of interrupted ḥadīth (*munqati‘*). Every problematic ḥadīth is interrupted, but not every interrupted ḥadīth is problematic. Some people, as stated above, call interrupted ḥadīth “loose” (*mursal*). The problematic ḥadīth consists of the ḥadīth having an isnād lacking two or more transmitters.

The scholars of ḥadīth say, “He transmitted the hadīth as problematic (*a‘dalahū*),” so the form of the term is *mu‘dal*. The derivation of this term is obscure from the standpoint of lexicography. I investigated the matter and found the phrase, *amr ‘adil*; that is, “an extremely difficult affair.” Pay no attention to the form *mu‘dil*, even if it is like *‘adil* in sense.

An example of a problematic ḥadīth is one which a student of a Follower (*jābi‘i al-Tābi‘i*) relates saying, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said.” Another example is a ḥadīth which someone lower than the students of the Followers relates directly from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) or from Abū Bakr, ‘Umar or others, without mentioning the intermediaries between that individual and himself. Abū Naṣr al-Sijzī brought up the case of a transmitter saying, “It reached me” (*balaghani*) – like Mālik’s saying, “It reached me from Abū Hurayra that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘The slave is due his food and clothing ...’” – and said, “The scholars of ḥadīth call that ‘problematic.’” Therefore, all of the instances when the jurists and others write in their books, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” and the like are considered problematic. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb at one point called this kind of ḥadīth “loose”<sup>1</sup> and that is in conformity with the doctrine of those who call all ḥadīth with incohesive isnāds “loose,” as was discussed above.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim made a type of problematic ḥadīth the instances when a student of a Follower relates from that Follower a ḥadīth halted at him while it is uninterrupted and supported (*muttaṣil musnad*) up to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) [from another student of the Follower].<sup>2</sup> An example is the ḥadīth we heard from al-A‘mash from Shāfi‘ī in which he said, “On the

---

1 *Kifāya*, 21.

2 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 38.

3 Abū ‘Amr Āmir b. Sharāḥīl al-Shāfi‘ī al-Kuṣī (19/640–103/721) was one of the most important early transmitters of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:277.

Day of Judgement it will be said to each man, ‘You did such and such’ and he will say, ‘I did not do that,’ and his mouth will be sealed ...” Al-A‘mash gave it as problematic and Sha‘bī elsewhere had the ḥadīth “[from Sha‘bī] from Anas from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him);” that is, as uninterrupted and supported. This is an excellent point, because interruption through the omission of one transmitter comes under the heading of being halted (*waqf*). This particular ḥadīth contains an interruption to the extent of two transmitters; that is, the Companion [that is, Anas] and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Therefore, it is more appropriately termed “problematic.” God knows best.

### Subsidiary Issues

1. The isnād containing the word “from” (*al-isnād al-mu‘an‘an*): this is the isnād in which “X from (‘an) Y” is said. Some people consider it loose and interrupted, until the cohesion of its isnād becomes clear through another [more explicit version of the isnād]. The correct view and that which is followed in practice is that it is a form of uninterrupted isnād. The majority of ḥadīth authorities and others have adopted this view and those who exclusively stipulate sound ḥadīth include ḥadīth with “from” in the isnād in their compilations and accept them. The expert in the ḥadīth and Qur‘ān Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr came close to claiming that there was a consensus of the ḥadīth experts on that<sup>4</sup> and Abū ‘Amr al-Dāni al-Muqrī<sup>5</sup> did claim that there was a consensus of transmitters on it. This holds true on the condition that it is established that those to whom the transmission by “from” (‘an‘ana) is ascribed met each other and were free of the taint of misrepresentation (*tadlis*). In that case it is interpreted in accordance with its apparent cohesion, unless something contradicting that comes to light.

In our time and in the recent past the use of “from” in licensing (*ijāza*)<sup>6</sup> has become common among those who consider themselves to be scholars of ḥadīth. When one of them says, “I recited to X from Y” (*qara‘tu ‘alā fulān ‘an fulān*), or something like that, it is understood from this that X related from Y by license and it is obvious that this does not keep it from being uninterrupted. God knows best.

2. There is disagreement over the interpretation of a transmitter saying, “that (anna) X said such and such.” Does it have the same status as “from” in regard to rendering the isnād cohesive, when it is established that the two transmitters

<sup>4</sup> In fact, Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr says that there was a consensus; *Tamhid*, 1:12.

<sup>5</sup> Abū ‘Amr ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘id al-Dāni al-Muqrī (371/981–444/1053) was a renowned Andalusian scholar who began reading ḥadīth at the age of fifteen and pursued his studies on a journey to the East. On his return, he composed a number of books and was considered to be especially expert in the Qur‘ān; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:516–17, *Suppl.*, 1:719–20; *EI*, 2:109–10.

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of this means of textual transmission, see below, Category 24.

met each other, that is, until evidence that there is an interruption in it comes to light? An example of this is "Mālik from Zuhri that Sa'īd b. al-Musayyib said such and such." We heard that Mālik (God be pleased with him) used to regard "from X" and "that X" as equal and that Ahmad b. Hanbal (God be pleased with him) regarded them as different. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr related from a large number of scholars that "from" and "that" are equal and that it is not a question of particles and words but rather of the transmitters meeting, attending class, having audition and seeing each other; that is, first granting freedom from misrepresentation. If the audition of the one from the other can be established, the ḥadīth of the one from the other is considered cohesive regardless of which term is used, until evidence of interruption appears. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr related from Abū Bakr al-Bardījī<sup>7</sup> that the particle "that" is interpreted as an instance of interruption, until evidence of audition appears for that very report from another line of transmission. Ibn 'Abd al-Barr said, "In my opinion this is nonsense because of the consensus of scholars that an isnād connected with a Companion is the same, whether that Companion says in it, 'The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,' or 'That the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,' or 'From the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) that he said,' or 'I heard the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saying.'"<sup>8</sup> God knows best.

In the superlative *Musnad* of the superlative Ya'qūb b. Shayba,<sup>9</sup> I found something similar to what Ibn 'Abd al-Barr related from the expert Abū Bakr al-Bardījī. Ya'qūb b. Shayba mentioned the ḥadīth Abu 'l-Zubayr<sup>10</sup> related from Ibn al-Ḥanafiya<sup>11</sup> from 'Ammār<sup>12</sup> in which 'Ammār said, "I went to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) while he was praying and I greeted him and he returned the greeting to me," and Ya'qūb b. Shayba made it a connected supported hadīth (*musnad mawṣūl*). Ya'qūb b. Shayba also mentioned the relation of that ḥadīth by Qays b. Sa'īd<sup>13</sup> "from 'Atā'

7 Abū Bakr Ahmad b. Hārūn al-Bardījī al-Bardhāqī (ca. 230/845–301/914) was a well-regarded transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:166–7.

8 *Tamhid*, 1:26.

9 Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb b. Shayba al-Sadūsī (ca. 180/796–262/875) was a follower of the doctrine of Mālik who eventually settled in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:144.

10 Abu 'l-Zubayr Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Tadrūs al-Makki (d. 126/743) was an important transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:86–7.

11 Muḥammad (16/637–81/700), the son of the Caliph 'Ali b. Abī Ṭalib, was called Ibn al-Ḥanafiya on account of his mother who was a member of the Banū Ḥanifa. After the death of al-Ḥusayn at Karbala<sup>9</sup> in 61/680 and the retirement of al-Ḥasan, Ibn al-Ḥanafiya became the rallying point for the opposition to the Umayyad regime, although he seems not to have personally played any active role; *EF*, 7:402–3.

12 Abu 'l-Yaqzān 'Ammār b. Yāsir al-'Anṣī al-Makki was one of the earliest converts to Islam and a participant at the Battle of Badr. He died at the age of ninety-three while fighting at the Battle of Siffin in 37/657; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 1:406–28.

13 Abū 'Abd Allāh (or 'Abd al-Malik) Qays b. Sa'īd al-Makki al-Ḥabashi died in 117/735; Bukhāri, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 4(1):154; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):99.

b. Abī Rabāḥ from Ibn al-Ḥanafīya *that* ‘Ammār passed the Prophet (Peace be upon him) while he was praying,” and he considered this version loose because Ibn al-Ḥanafīya said, “that ‘Ammār did something” and did not say, “from ‘Ammār.” (God knows best.) Al-Khaṭīb in treating this question cites as an example the ḥadīth, “Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar from ‘Umar that he asked the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), ‘Is one of us allowed to go to sleep while he is in a state of ritual impurity ...’” In another transmission it reads, “From Nāfi‘ from Ibn ‘Umar *that* ‘Umar said, ‘Messenger of God ...’” He says, “The outward form of the first relation necessitates that it be considered one of the supported ḥadīth of ‘Umar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and the outward form of the second necessitates that it be considered one of the supported ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Umar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him).”<sup>14</sup> This example is not relevant to what concerns us here, because in this matter – according to the doctrine of a great number of scholars – judging cohesion depends exclusively on meeting and contemporaneousness [that is, rather than on the terminology appearing in the isnād], and in this ḥadīth these were mutual and repeated because of Ibn ‘Umar’s connection to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and to ‘Umar (God be pleased with him), in addition to the transmitter Ibn ‘Umar’s status as a companion of both of them. Al-Khaṭīb’s interpretation would require, on the basis of the one line of transmission [that is, the second], that Ibn ‘Umar related the ḥadīth from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and, on the basis of the other, that Ibn ‘Umar related it from ‘Umar from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God knows best.

3. We have mentioned the remarks Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related concerning the general application of the judgement of cohesion to the ḥadīth which a transmitter gives from someone whom he met, regardless of the term used [in the isnād]. Similarly, Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī al-ṣayrafi<sup>15</sup> gave a general statement of that and said, “The transmission of every student who is known to have heard ḥadīth from an individual and transmitted from him is considered to be a case of audition, until it becomes known that the student did not hear from him [the particular ḥadīth] he related. The same is also true of the transmission of every student who is known to have met an individual and transmitted ḥadīth from him.”

Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī said that regarding only those from whom no misrepresentation came to light. One argument for that – which is also applicable to the entire subject – is that if the student had not heard the ḥadīth from his alleged teacher, he would become a misrepresenter

14 *Kifāya*, 407.

15 The renowned *Ghaylāntyāt* is the collection of the best ḥadīth of Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allah al-Shāfi‘ī al-ṣayrafi (260/874–354/965); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:191.

by unqualifiedly relating the ḥadīth from that individual without mentioning the intermediary between them. Freedom from the taint of misrepresentation is presumed and the remarks apply to someone who is not known to have committed misrepresentation.

One of the examples of that is the transmitter saying, "X said such and such," like Nāfi' saying, "Ibn 'Umar said." The same would apply if Nāfi' had said regarding him, "Ibn 'Umar mentioned," "Ibn 'Umar did," "Ibn 'Umar transmitted," "Ibn 'Umar used to say such and such," or other similar phrases. All of that is interpreted presumptively as indicating cohesion and that the student received the ḥadīth from the teacher without any intermediary between them, whenever the fact that he met him is established in general.

For the fulfillment of this condition which is stipulated in these cases and similar ones, there are some who confine themselves to the actual occurrence of a meeting or audition, as we related above. Abū 'Amr [al-Dānī] al-Muqrī<sup>16</sup> said in this regard, "If the student is known to have transmitted from the teacher, [it is enough]." On this issue Abu 'l-Hasan al-Qābīsī<sup>17</sup> said, "If it is clear that the student was a contemporary of the person from whom he transmitted." Concerning transmission by "from," Abu 'l-Muẓaffar [Mansūr] al-Samcānī said that a long acquaintance between the student and the teacher is stipulated. In the introduction to his *Sahīh*,<sup>18</sup> Muslim b. al-Hajjāj reproached one of his contemporaries for stipulating the confirmation of a meeting or coming together taking place in the case of a transmission by "from." He claimed that it was a made-up doctrine which was unprecedented and that the doctrine common and accepted among the scholars knowledgeable in reports in early and modern times was that confirmation that the student and his alleged teacher lived at the same time was enough in this regard, even if no evidence in any report ever surfaced indicating that they met and spoke to each other. There is some doubt about Muslim's remarks. It was said that the doctrine which he rejected was that of the authorities of this science, 'Alī b. al-Madīnī, Bukhārī and others. (God knows best.) I do not think that this judgement [that is, the one ascribed to 'Alī b. al-Madīnī and Bukhārī] lasted past the era of the ancients, since authors say in their books in regard to the material they quote from their teachers, "X mentioned," "X said" and the like [that is, rather than "I heard X saying," and so forth]. So try to understand that, for it is important and valuable. God knows best.

#### 4. The suspension (*ta'liq*) which Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Humaydī – the author of *al-Jāmi'* *bayn al-Sahīhayn* – and other North Africans mention in regard to some of the ḥadīth in the *Sahīh* of Bukhārī with cut-off isnāds (*quṭī'a isnāduhā*):

<sup>16</sup> Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf al-Maṭāṣfīt al-Qābīsī (344/955–403/1012) was a blind North African scholar prominent in ḥadīth, law and Qur'ānic studies; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:158–61.

<sup>17</sup> *Al-Jāmi'* *al-sahīh*, 1:23; G.H.A. Juynboll, "Muslim's Introduction," 295.

Dāraqutnī had earlier used the term. The isnād of the suspended ḥadīth is interrupted in form, but it is not treated in the same way and the ḥadīth containing the suspension does not go from being sound to weak. This is because of what is known of Bukhārī's standard and his treatment [of the suspended ḥadīth], as we pointed out in the sixth note of Category 1.

No attention is to be paid to the Zāhirite Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥazm's<sup>18</sup> rejection of the ḥadīth of Abū ‘Āmir – or as he is also known “Abū Mālik” – al-Ash‘arī<sup>19</sup> from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) which Bukhārī included: “Verily, there will be in my Community peoples who regard silk, wine and string instruments as licit ...”<sup>20</sup> on the basis that Bukhārī cited it saying, “Hishām b. ‘Ammār<sup>21</sup> said,” and gave it with Hishām's isnād. Ibn Ḥazm claimed that it is interrupted in its transmission between Bukhārī and Hishām and made that an argument against citing it as a proof for the banning of string instruments. In doing that, Ibn Ḥazm erred in several respects. The ḥadīth is sound and is known to be uninterrupted according to the standard of the sound ḥadīth. Bukhārī (God bless him) sometimes does something like this because the ḥadīth is well known from several trustworthy transmitters from the individual from whom he suspended it. Other times he does this because he has mentioned the ḥadīth in another place in his book in a supported and uninterrupted form. He also occasionally does this for other reasons unrelated to the fault of interruption. God knows best.

The verdict we mentioned concerning the aforementioned suspension refers to the ḥadīth Bukhārī included as the principal part and substance of the text of his book, and not to the suspended ḥadīth he included for reference citation. Included among the citations are ḥadīth – both suspended and connected – which do not meet the standard of the sound ḥadīth. I found the term “suspension” used for the ḥadīth lacking one transmitter or more from the beginning of its isnād and some even use it for the omission of the entire isnād, for instance, Bukhārī saying, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” “Ibn ‘Abbās said such and such,” “Abū Hurayra related such and such,” “Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib said from Abū Hurayra: such and such,” and “Zuhri said

<sup>18</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd (384/994–456/1064), known as Ibn Ḥazm, was the author of a number of important works in law, theology and literature; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:505–6, *Suppl.*, 1:692–7; *EP* 3:790–99.

<sup>19</sup> Ubayd b. Salim (or Wahb) al-Ash‘arī was the uncle of the famous Companion Abū Muṣa al-Ash‘arī. He served as a lieutenant of the Prophet before being killed in action in the year 8/629; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭiqāb*, 4:1704–5.

<sup>20</sup> *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 4:30 (K. al-Ashriba, B. Ma jā'a fi-man yastahillu 'l-khamr wa-yusammih bi-ghayr ismih).

<sup>21</sup> Abu 'l-Walid Hishām b. ‘Ammār al-Sulamī, the *khaṭīb* of Damascus, was born in 153/770 and died in 245/859; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:420–35.

from Abū Salama<sup>22</sup> from Abū Hurayra from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) such and such." This applies to the transmitters of the generations earlier than that of Bukhārī's teachers. The ḥadīth he gave from his own teachers-in this fashion are of the type of ḥadīth we just mentioned in the third of these Subsidiary Issues.

I read that one of the later North African scholars made [the instances in which Bukhārī writes regarding one of his teachers, "X said," "X related," and so forth] a second subcategory of suspension and also added to this subcategory the several instances where Bukhārī says in his book, "X said *to me*" and "X related *to us*." The North African characterized all of that as suspension which is uninterrupted from the standpoint of outward form and incohesive (*munfaṣil*) from the standpoint of sense. He said, "When you see Bukhārī saying, 'X said to me' and 'X said to us,' be aware that it is an isnād which he does not mention for citation as a proof and he mentioned it only for reference. Transmitters of ḥadīth often use these phrases [for example, "X said to me" and "X related to us"] to indicate those ḥadīth which pass between them in study sessions and competitions. They rarely cite as proofs the ḥadīth mentioned in study sessions." The allegation he makes against Bukhārī is contrary to what a scholar who is earlier and more knowledgeable in Bukhārī – namely the pious servant of God, Abū Ja'far b. Ḥamdān al-Nisābūrī<sup>23</sup> – said. We heard that he said, "Whenever Bukhārī says, 'X said to me,' it is presentation ('ard) and transference (*munāwala*)."<sup>24</sup>

I have not come across any instances of the term "suspension" being used for ḥadīth in which some of the men of the isnād are omitted from its middle or its end or for phrases like, "It is related from X" (*yurwā 'an fulān*), "It is mentioned from X" (*yudhkaru 'an fulān*) and similar expressions lacking any definite indication that the transmitter to whom the ḥadīth is ascribed actually said or mentioned it.

It appears that this usage of the term "suspension" is derived from the "suspension" of a wall [by removing the earth from underneath a section of it], the "suspension" of a divorce [by stipulating a hitherto unmet condition for it] and the like, on account of the common element of the rupture of cohesion present in each of them. God knows best.<sup>25</sup>

22 Abū Salama b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Zuhri (ca. 20/641–94/713) was a famous Medinese transmitter of ḥadīth from the generation of the Followers. His *ism* is disputed; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:287–92.

23 Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Ḥamdān al-Nisābūrī (ca. 240/854–311/924) was a devoted scholar of ḥadīth who traveled extensively; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 14:299–303.

24 For the discussion of these two means of transmission, see below, Section 24.

25 See Edward W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 8 vols (London, 1863–93), 5:2133. Cf. W. Marçais, *Taqrib*, 47, n. 2.

5. The ḥadīth that one reliable transmitter relates as loose and another reliable transmitter relates as uninterrupted: the scholars of ḥadīth differ over the question of whether it should be counted as connected or loose. For instance, “No marriage without a guardian.” Isrā’il b. Yūnus<sup>26</sup> – among others – related it in supported form from his grandfather Abū Ishaq al-Sabi‘i from Abū Burda<sup>27</sup> from his father Abū Mūsa al-Ash‘ari<sup>28</sup> from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); that is, as uninterrupted. Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu‘ba<sup>29</sup> related it from Abū Ishaq from Abū Burda from the Prophet (Peace be upon him); that is, as loose. The expert al-Khaṭīb said that in this case and similar ones most of the scholars of ḥadīth rule in favor of the loose form.<sup>30</sup> However, it is also related from some of the scholars of ḥadīth that the verdict is to be given in favor of the form given by the majority of transmitters. From others it is related that the judgement goes to the better-documented version. That is, if the person who transmits it as loose was superior in regard to retention to the person who transmits it as connected, the judgement is in favor of the transmitter who gives it as loose. Some say that this does not impugn the integrity or qualifications of the transmitter who gives the ḥadīth as connected. Others do say that the integrity and acceptability of the person who gives the ḥadīth in supported form – as well as his supported version of the ḥadīth – are impugned when the experts give it as loose. Others say the verdict is in favor of the transmitter who gives it as supported; if he is upright and accurate, so his report is accepted, even if one or several transmitters contradict him. Al-Khaṭīb said that this last view is the correct one.<sup>31</sup> What he regarded as correct is the correct doctrine for the fields of positive law and legal theory. Furthermore, Bukhārī was asked about the previously mentioned ḥadīth, “No marriage without a guardian,” and he passed judgement in favor of those who transmitted it as connected, saying, “An addition from a reliable transmitter (*al-ziyāda min al-thiqā*) is accepted.” Bukhārī said this despite the fact that Shu‘ba and Sufyān [al-Thawrī] gave it as loose and they were towering figures possessing the highest degree of retention and exactitude.

Connected with this is the question which arises when the transmitter who gives a ḥadīth as connected is also the one who gives it as loose, transmitting it as connected at one time and loose at another. Also related to this is the case

26 Abū Yūsuf Isrā’il b. Yūnus al-Sabi‘i al-Kūfi (100/719–ca. 160/777) was best known for transmitting from his grandfather; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:355–61.

27 Abū Burda Hārith (or ‘Amir) al-Ash‘ari (d. ca. 100/719) served as the *qādi* of al-Kūfa during the governorship of al-Hajjāj; *EP*, 1:693–4.

28 Abū Mūsa ‘Abd Allāh b. Qays al-Ash‘ari was one of the most prolific transmitters from the Prophet. He served as the governor of al-Baṣra and al-Kūfa during the reign of ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Ali, acting as ‘Ali’s arbiter at Ṣiffīn in 37/657. He died in al-Kūfa around the year 42/662; *EP*, 1:695.

29 Abū Bishām Shu‘ba b. al-Hajjāj (82/701–160/776) was one of the most prominent transmitters of ḥadīth in al-Baṣra; *EP*, 9:491–2; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:92.

30 *Kifāya*, 411.

31 *Kifāya*, 411.

when a transmitter raises (*rafa'a*) a ḥadīth to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and someone else halts (*maqasa*) it at a Companion; or a single transmitter gives it as raised at one time and also gives it as halted at another. As well as can be determined, the verdict in all of these cases is in favor of what the reliable transmitter adds in terms of connectedness (*wuṣl*) and raising (*raf'*), because he positively affirms [the presence of the intervening transmitter] while the other transmitter is merely silent. If the other had been positively negating, the one who affirms would still take precedence over him because he may have some information unknown to the other. This present segment has a connection to the section on the addition of a reliable transmitter to a ḥadīth [that is, Category 16] and that will come later, God (He is exalted) willing. God knows best.

## Category 12

### MISREPRESENTATION AND THE TREATMENT OF MISREPRESENTED HADITH

(*Ma'rifat al-tadlis wa-hukm al-mudallas*)

There are two subcategories of misrepresentation. The first is misrepresentation in the isnād (*tadlis al-isnād*). This consists either of a transmitter relating from someone he met ḥadīth he did not hear from him, giving the erroneous impression that he heard the ḥadīth from him; or of a transmitter relating ḥadīth from someone who lived at the same time as he whom he did not meet, promoting the false notion that he met him and heard the ḥadīth from him. There may be a single individual intervening between the transmitter and his alleged teacher or there may be more. The transmitter should not say in these instances, "X informed us" (*akhbaranā fulān*), "X transmitted to us" (*haddathanā fulān*) or similar expressions. The transmitter should only say, "X said" (*qāla fulān*), "From X" (*'an fulān*) and the like. An illustration of that is the report we heard from 'Alī b. Khashram<sup>1</sup> in which he said, "We were with [Sufyān] b. 'Uyayna and he said, 'Zuhri said.' Someone asked him, 'Zuhri transmitted to you?' He fell silent and then said, 'Zuhri said.' Then someone asked him, 'Did you hear it from Zuhri?' He said, 'No, I did not hear it from Zuhri, nor did I hear it from someone who heard it from Zuhri. 'Abd al-Razzāq related it to me from Ma'mar<sup>2</sup> from Zuhri."<sup>3</sup>

The second subcategory of misrepresentation is the misrepresentation of teachers (*tadlis al-shuyūkh*). This consists of a transmitter relating from a teacher a ḥadīth he did hear from him and referring to him by an unfamiliar name, paidonymic, gentilic or a description to conceal his identity. An example of this is the story related to us about the authority Abū Bakr b. Mujāhid al-Muqrī<sup>4</sup> to the effect that he related from Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī,<sup>5</sup> saying, "'Abd Allāh b. Abī 'Abd Allāh transmitted to us.' He also related from Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqqāsh<sup>6</sup> – the Qur'ān commentator

1 The ḥadīth expert Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Khashram al-Marwazī was born in 160/776 and died 257/811; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:552–3.

2 Abū 'Urwa Ma'mar b. Rāshid (96/714–154/770) was a early expert in ḥadīth and Prophetic biography; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:290–91.

3 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Mūsā b. al-'Abbās b. Mujāhid al-Baghdādī (245/859–324/936) was an expert on the variant readings of the Qur'ān and author of the famous text on the subject, *Kitāb al-Sab'a fi manāzil al-qurra'*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:14.

4 Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī (230/844–316/929) was the son of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, the compiler of the famous ḥadīth collection *Kitāb al-Sunan*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:174–5.

5 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Naqqāsh (266/880–351/962) was a celebrated expert in the various recensions of the Qur'ān; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:44.<sup>7</sup> According to the *nasab al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī* gives in *Ta'rikh Baghdaḍ* (2:201), Sanad was Muḥammad's great, great, great, great-grandfather.

and reciter – saying, “Muhammad b. Sanad transmitted to us,” naming as Muhammad’s father one of his more remote ancestors. God knows best.

The first subcategory of misrepresentation is extremely detestable and the majority of scholars condemn it. Shu‘ba was one of the most severe in condemnation of it. We heard from the imām Shāfi‘ī that Shu‘ba said, “Misrepresentation is the brother of falsehood.” We also heard that Shu‘ba said, “I would rather commit adultery than misrepresentation.” Shu‘ba’s excessive zeal to suppress and deter misrepresentation carried him into hyperbole. Scholars differ over the question of whether one may accept the transmission of someone known for this kind of misrepresentation. One faction of ḥadīth scholars and legal experts discredits the misrepresenter, saying, “His transmission is not to be accepted under any circumstance, whether he makes clear that he heard a particular ḥadīth from his teacher or not.” The correct course is to make a distinction. The ḥadīth a misrepresenter relates with an equivocal expression which does not make clear the audition and cohesion of the ḥadīth is treated like the various types of loose ḥadīth (*mursal*). The ḥadīth he relates with an expression that clearly indicates cohesion – like “I heard” (*sami‘tu*), “He transmitted to us” (*haddathana*), “He informed us” (*akhbaranā*) and similar ones – may be accepted and employed as a proof. There are very many ḥadīth of this kind in the two *Sahīhs* and other well-respected books, like the transmissions of Qatāda,<sup>6</sup> al-A‘mash, the two Sufyāns [that is, Sufyān al-Thawri and Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna], Hushaym b. Bashīr and others. This is because misrepresentation is not falsehood: rather it is a kind of deliberate obfuscation through use of an equivocal expression. The correct approach is not to accept a ḥadīth from someone known to have misrepresented until he makes clear [that he actually heard it from his teacher by using a definitive expression]. Indeed, Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) applied this rule to those we know to have committed misrepresentation only a single time. God knows best.

The second subcategory of misrepresentation is less serious. It consists of the [virtual] omission of the person transmitted from and making it difficult for the person who seeks to know his state and suitability to discover his identity. The degree of repugnance of that varies according to the motive for it. Sometimes the transmitter misrepresents the name of his teacher because he was unreliable. At other times the teacher was someone who lived until relatively recent times and many students younger than the transmitter also heard ḥadīth from him, or the teacher himself may have been younger than the transmitter. In other instances the student may transmit many hadīth from a particular teacher and he may not like to mention him so many times under a single form of his name. A number of transmitters who wrote books permitted this last kind of misrepresentation, including Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb. He did it often in his works. God knows best.

<sup>6</sup> Abu ’l-Khaṭṭāb Qatāda b. Dī‘āma al-Sadūsī (60/679–118/736) was one of the most important early transmitters of hadīth in al-Baṣra; *EI*, 4:748; Sezgin; *GAS*, 1:31–2.

<sup>7</sup> Abū Mu‘awiya Hushaym b. Bashīr al-Sulamī (104/722–183/799) was a famous Qur‘ān commentator from Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:38.

Category 13  
ANOMALOUS ḤADITH  
(*Ma‘rifat al-shādhah*)

---

We heard that Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-Āqā<sup>1</sup> said, “Shāfi‘ (God be pleased with him) said, ‘The anomalous ḥadīth is not one which a single reliable transmitter and no one else relates. Rather, the anomalous ḥadīth is one which a reliable transmitter relates and which is in conflict with what other people relate.’” Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalili al-Qazwīnī<sup>2</sup> related something similar to this from Shāfi‘ (God bless him) and a number of the Hejazians. He said, “The view of the experts in ḥadīth is that the anomalous ḥadīth is one having only a single isnād which a single teacher, reliable or not, is ‘anomalous’ (*yashidhdhu*) in transmitting. An anomalous ḥadīth from an unreliable transmitter is rejected and may not be accepted; one from a reliable transmitter is left in abeyance and may not be cited as a proof.”<sup>3</sup> The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥakīm said that the anomalous ḥadīth is one which a single reliable individual is alone in transmitting and which lacks a parallel version (*asl*) in agreement with the version in the hands of the reliable transmitter. He said that the anomalous ḥadīth differs from the defective ḥadīth (*mu‘allal*) in that a defective ḥadīth contains a known defect indicating the location of the error in it and in the case of the anomalous ḥadīth no defect in it is known in such a fashion.<sup>4</sup>

There is no question that what Shāfi‘ judged to be anomalous is a form of the anomalous ḥadīth which may not be accepted. As for the statements we gave from the others, there is some question about the ḥadīth which an upright, retentive and precise transmitter is alone in relating, like the ḥadīth, “Acts are judged by intentions.” This is an isolated ḥadīth (*ḥadīth fard*) which ‘Umar [b. al-Khaṭṭāb] (God be pleased with him) alone transmitted from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). ‘Alqama b. Waqqās<sup>5</sup> was alone in transmitting it from ‘Umar, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm<sup>6</sup> was alone in transmitting it from ‘Alqama and Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd [al-Anṣārī] was alone in transmitting it from Muḥammad b.

---

1 Abu Mūsa Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-Āqā al-Ṣadafī al-Miṣrī (170/787–264/877) was a famous student of the imām Shāfi‘; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:348–51.

2 Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalil b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Khalili al-Qazwīnī (d. 446/1055) was one of the greatest ḥadīth scholars of his day. His *Kitāb al-Irshād fi ma‘rifat ‘ulamā’ al-ḥadīth* (ed. Muḥammad Sa‘īd b. ‘Umar Idrīs, 3 vols., Riyadh, 1409/1989) has recently been published. He also wrote a *Tārīkh Qazwīn* and a work on the Followers, both of which seem to be lost; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:446, *Suppl.*, 1:618.

3 *Irshād*, 1:176.

4 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 119.

5 ‘Alqama b. Waqqās al-Laythī was a poorly known Medinese transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 75/694; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:61–2.

6 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. al-Ḥārith al-Taymī (d. ca. 120/738) was considered one of the great scholars of Medina; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:294–6.

Ibrāhīm, according to what the scholars of ḥadīth regard as correct. A clearer instance of an anomalous ḥadīth than this is the ḥadīth of ‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār<sup>7</sup> from Ibn ‘Umar to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) forbade the sale and gifting of clientship. ‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār alone transmitted it. Another case is the ḥadīth of Mālik from Zuhri from Anas to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) entered Mecca with a helmet lining on his head. Mālik was alone in transmitting it from Zuhri. All of these ḥadīth are included in the two *Sahīhs* despite each having only a single isnād which a single reliable transmitter was alone in giving. There are more than a few similar cases of this in the book *Gharā’ib al-ṣahīḥ (Rare Sound ḥadīth)*.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, Muslim b. al-Hajjāj said, “Zuhri relates about ninety reports (*ḥarf*) from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which no one else transmits with good isnāds.” God knows best.

The doctrines of the ḥadīth authorities which we mentioned and those which we did not should make it plain to you that the question of the anomalous ḥadīth is not as clear cut as Abū Yaqīl [al-Khalili] and al-Hākim represent it. Rather, the question requires making the distinction which we will explain. We maintain that when a transmitter is alone in relating something, it should be examined. If the ḥadīth he alone transmitted is in conflict with what someone superior to him in retentiveness of that material and accuracy related, the ḥadīth he was alone in relating is a rejected anomalous hadīth. If there is in his transmission no conflict with what someone else transmitted – and it is something he and no one else related – then the transmitter who is alone in relating it is examined. If he is upright and retentive and his exactitude and precision may be trusted, the ḥadīth he is alone in transmitting is accepted and his being alone in transmitting the ḥadīth does not impugn it, as was true in the case of the previous examples. If he was one of those whose retention and exactitude in transmission may not be trusted for those ḥadīth which he is alone in transmitting, then his being alone in transmitting the ḥadīth pierces it and tears it from the domain of sound ḥadīth.

Beyond that, the anomalous ḥadīth oscillate between various levels according to the state they are in. If the transmitter who was alone in relating the anomalous ḥadīth is not far from the level of the retentive and precise transmitter whose unparalleled transmissions are accepted, we regard that ḥadīth of his as fair and we do not put it in the category of weak ḥadīth. If he falls far short of that level, we reject the ḥadīth he alone transmits and it is considered an unfamiliar anomalous ḥadīth (*al-shādhah al-munkar*). From that, it may be deduced that there are two subcategories of the rejected anomalous ḥadīth. One is the contradictory isolated ḥadīth (*al-fard al-mukhālif*). The second is the isolated ḥadīth the transmitter of which does not possess sufficient reliability and precision to counteract the unfamiliarity and weakness that isolation and anomaly engender. God knows best.

7 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār al-‘Adawī (d. 127/745) transmitted about two hundred ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:253–5.

8 A work entitled *Gharā’ib al-ṣahīḥ ma-afrāduhū* is ascribed to Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s renowned Damascene contemporary Diya’ al-Din al-Maqdisī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid (569/1173–643/1245); Kattānī, *Risāla*, 113.

Category 14  
UNFAMILIAR ḤADĪTH<sup>1</sup>  
(*Ma‘rifat al-munkar min al-ḥadīth*)

---

We read that the expert Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Hārūn al-Bardījī wrote that the unfamiliar ḥadīth is one which a single man is alone in transmitting while its text is not known from any transmission but his, not from the line of transmission he gave nor from any other. Bardījī treated them as a group and made no distinctions. In the remarks of many of the scholars of ḥadīth, we find a blanket condemnation of the ḥadīth isolated as rejected, unfamiliar or anomalous (*iṭlāq al-hukm ‘ala ‘l-tafarrud bi-‘l-radd aw al-nakāra aw al-shudhūdh*).

The correct course in the matter is to make the distinction which we explained above, in the discussion of the anomalous ḥadīth. On this subject we say: unfamiliar ḥadīth fall into two subcategories, in accordance with what we said concerning the anomalous ḥadīth, for “unfamiliar” means the same thing as “anomalous.” An example of the first subcategory of the unfamiliar ḥadīth – and it is the isolated ḥadīth (*munfarad*) which contradicts what the reliable transmitters relate – is the relation of Mālik from Zuhri from ‘Alī b. Iḥusayn from ‘Umar b. Uthmān<sup>2</sup> from Usāma b. Zayd<sup>3</sup> from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): “A Muslim may not inherit from an unbeliever and an unbeliever may not inherit from a Muslim.” Mālik contradicted the other reliable transmitters by saying, “‘Umar b. Uthmān.” Muslim – the author of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* – said in his *Kitāb al-Tamyiz*<sup>4</sup> (*Book on Discrimination*) that all of those who relate the ḥadīth from the other students of Zuhri say, “‘Amr b. Uthmān,” and he mentioned that

---

1 The term *munkar* is problematic and translators have differed in their rendering of it. The difficulty results from a shift in its significance over time. The earliest writers on ḥadīth used it as a synonym of general terms like *qaṣif* and *mardūd*. See, for instance, G.H.A. Juynboll’s “Muslim’s Introduction,” 269, where it is justifiably translated “rejected.” Later Muslim authors attached a more specific meaning to the word, usually one close, as here, to that of *shādhah*; see the remarks of W. Marçais in his translation of Nawawī’s *Tagrīb*, 56, n. 3. There can be no doubt that the usage of later writers ultimately derived from the definitions of the *munkar* ḥadīth provided by earlier scholars. However, where the earlier authors were describing the general characteristics of the broad class of ḥadīth they found unacceptable, the later ones interpreted these descriptions as referring to one specific type of unsatisfactory ḥadīth.

2 ‘Umar (Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 3[2]:178) and his brother ‘Amr (Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:353) were best known for being transmitters from their father, the third caliph Uthmān b. ‘Affān (r. 23/644–35/656).

3 Usāma b. Zayd (d. ca. 60/680) was a favorite of the Prophet and at the age of eighteen was made the commander of the Muslim forces invading Syria; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:496–507.

4 Muslim’s *Kitāb al-Tamyiz* has not reached us wholly intact and I have not succeeded in locating this passage in either the edition of Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Aṣzamī (Riyadh, n.d.) or that of Muḥammad Ṣubḥī Ḥasan Ḥallāq (Alexandria, n.d.).

Mālik used to point to the house of ‘Umar b. Uthmān with his hand, as if he was aware that the other transmitters disagreed with him. ‘Amr and ‘Umar were both sons of Uthmān. However, this ḥadīth comes only from ‘Amr. Muslim and others adjudged Mālik to have erred in it. God knows best.

An example of the second subcategory of the unfamiliar ḥadīth – that is, the isolated ḥadīth (*fard*) the transmitter of which does not possess reliability and exactitude sufficient to allow him to transmit it by himself – is the ḥadīth we heard from Abū Zukayr Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Qays<sup>5</sup> from Hishām b. ‘Urwa<sup>6</sup> from his father<sup>7</sup> from ‘Ā’isha<sup>8</sup> (God be pleased with her) that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Eat fresh dates with dried dates. When Satan sees that, it angers him and he says, ‘The son of Adam lived until he ate the new with the shabby.’” Abū Zukayr was alone in transmitting it. He was a pious teacher whose ḥadīth Muslim included in his book. However, he did not attain the stature of those whose unique transmissions are suffered. God knows best.

5 Abū Zukayr (d. 200/816) was generally considered to be an unreliable transmitter; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:296–9.

6 Hishām b. ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (ca. 61/680–146/763) was a respected scholar of ḥadīth and law; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:88–9.

7 ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr b. al-Awwām (ca. 25/646–ca. 95/714) was considered one of the great jurists of the city of Medina; *EF*, 4:1047; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:278–9.

8 ‘Ā’isha (d. 58/678) was the daughter of the future caliph Abū Bakr and one of the favorite wives of the Prophet; *EF*, 1:307–8.

## Category 15

### ANALYSIS, PARALLELISMS AND ATTESTATIONS

(*Ma‘rifat al-i‘tibār wa-‘l-mutāba‘at wa-‘l-shawāhid*)

---

These are matters which scholars take up in their examination of the condition of a ḥadīth: was its transmitter alone in transmitting it or not? Is it well known or not? The expert Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī (God – He is exalted – bless him) gave an example of the procedure for analyzing reports.

Ḥammād b. Salama<sup>1</sup> relates an unparalleled ḥadīth (*ḥadīth lam yutāba‘ qalayhi*) from Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyāni] from [Muhammad] b. Sirīn from Abū Hurayra from the Prophet (Peace be upon him). It is examined: did a reliable transmitter other than Ayyūb relate it from Ibn Sirīn? If that is found, it is known that the report has an original version (*asl*) to which it goes back. If that is not found, then does a reliable transmitter other than Ibn Sirīn relate it from Abū Hurayra? If not, does a Companion other than Abū Hurayra relate it from the Prophet (Peace be upon him)? If any of that is found, it is thereby known that the ḥadīth has an original version to which it goes back. If it is not found, the ḥadīth does not have one.<sup>2</sup>

An example of parallelism would be that someone other than Ḥammād relates that very same ḥadīth from Ayyūb. This is “complete parallelism” (*al-mutāba‘a al-tāmma*). If no one but Ḥammād relates it from Ayyūb, but someone else relates it from Ibn Sirīn or from Abū Hurayra or if someone other than Abū Hurayra relates it from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); that also is sometimes termed “parallelism” without qualification. But it is inferior to the first kind of parallelism to the extent it falls short of it. It may also be called an “attestation” (*shāhid*).

If that ḥadīth is not related at all from one of the aforementioned lines of transmission, but another ḥadīth having the same meaning is related; that is an attestation without parallelism. If another ḥadīth with the same meaning is not related, then the absolute uniqueness (*al-tafarrud al-muṭlaq*) of the ḥadīth is established. Ḥadīth of this kind are divided into the rejected unfamiliar ḥadīth (*mardūd munkar*) and the unrejected, as stated above. When they say regarding something like this, “Abū Hurayra was alone in transmitting it [from the Prophet], Ibn Sirīn was alone in transmitting it from Abū Hurayra, Ayyūb was alone in transmitting it from Ibn Sirīn and Ḥammād b. Salama was alone in transmitting

---

1 Abū Salama Ḥammād b. Salama b. Dīnār al-Baṣrī (d. 167/783) was one of the most famous transmitters of ḥadīth of his age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:444–57.

2 Ibn Ḥibbān, *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, ed. Ahmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1952), 1:117–18.

it from Ayyūb;” there is an indication in that of the nonexistence of lines of transmission for parallels of the ḥadīth.

Be aware that sometimes the relation of someone whose ḥadīth should not be cited as proofs when he is by himself – indeed, he may be considered a weak transmitter – may sometimes be included for the sake of establishing parallelism or as the citation of an attestation. Bukhārī and Muslim in their books mention the ḥadīth of a number of weak transmitters as parallels and attestations. Not every weak transmitter is suitable for this. For that reason Dāraqutnī and others have said about weak transmitters, “X, his transmissions may be taken into consideration” (*fulān yu’tabaru bihi*) and “Y, his transmissions may not be taken into consideration.” Something like this was pointed out above. God knows best.

The following is an example of a parallel and attestation: We heard the ḥadīth of Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna from ‘Amr b. Dīnār<sup>3</sup> from ‘Aṭā’ b. Abī Rabāḥ from Ibn ‘Abbās in which the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said, “If they had taken its hide and tanned it, they would have derived some benefit from it.” Ibn Jurayj<sup>4</sup> related the ḥadīth from ‘Amr from ‘Aṭā’ and he did not mention the tanning. The expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqī<sup>5</sup> gave a parallel version and attestation of the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Uyayna. Usāma b. Zayd transmitted a parallel version from ‘Aṭā’. Ahmad al-Bayhaqī related with his isnād from Usāma from ‘Aṭā’ from Ibn ‘Abbās this version in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Did you not strip its hide off and tan it, so that you could enjoy it?” Ahmad al-Bayhaqī gave as an attestation the ḥadīth of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Waqāla<sup>6</sup> from Ibn ‘Abbās, “He said, ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘Any hide that is tanned becomes ritually clean.’’” God knows best.

<sup>3</sup> Abu Muḥammad ‘Amr b. Dīnār (ca. 46/666–126/743) was a legal expert in Mecca; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:300–7.

<sup>4</sup> Abu Khālid (or Abu ’l-Walīd) ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Jurayj (80/699–150/767 or 151) was one of the most prominent Hejazian scholars of ḥadīth of his day; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:91.

<sup>5</sup> *Kitāb al-Sunan al-kubrā*, 1:16 (K. al-Tahāra, B. Tahārat jild al-mayyita bi-’l-dabgh).

<sup>6</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(2):296.

Category 16

**ADDITIONS OF RELIABLE TRANSMITTERS  
AND THE TREATMENT OF THEM**

*(Ma'rifat ziyādāt al-thiqāt wa-hukmihā)*

---

This is a sublime discipline which deserves careful attention. The authorities Abū Bakr b. Ziyād al-Nisābūrī,<sup>1</sup> Abū Nu'aym al-Jurjānī<sup>2</sup> and Abu 'l-Walid al-Qurashi<sup>3</sup> have been mentioned for their knowledge of the textual additions relevant to the study of law in certain ḥadīth. According to what Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related, the doctrine of the majority of the scholars of law and ḥadīth is that an addition of a reliable transmitter is acceptable when he is alone in transmitting it, irrespective of whether that addition is from a single individual who related the ḥadīth once without the addition and another time with it or whether the addition is from someone other than the transmitter who related the ḥadīth without the addition.<sup>4</sup> This is contrary to the view of those scholars of ḥadīth who reject additions without exception and the view of those who reject additions from the original transmitter but accept them from someone else. We cited above<sup>5</sup> al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī's relation from the majority of ḥadīth experts to the effect that if some people give a ḥadīth with a cohesive isnād (*waṣala l-hadīth*) and others give it as loose (*arsalahū*), the verdict is in favor of those who transmit it as loose, even if the addition rendering it cohesive is from a reliable transmitter. I have arrived at the opinion that the material a reliable transmitter is alone in relating falls into three subcategories.

1. It contradicts and is incompatible with what the rest of the reliable transmitters related. The verdict on this kind is rejection, as was previously stated in the Category on anomalous ḥadīth.
2. It contains absolutely no incompatibility with or contradiction of what others related, like the ḥadīth the totality of which a reliable transmitter is alone in relating and through which he does not come into conflict at all with what others relate. This kind is acceptable and al-Khaṭīb has indeed claimed that scholars agree on that. Something similar was discussed above in the Category on anomalous ḥadīth.

---

1 Abū Bakr 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Nisābūrī (d. 324/936) was considered the greatest Shāfi'iite jurist of his era in Iraq; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:65–8.

2 Abū Nu'aym 'Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. 'Adī al-Jurjānī was a Shāfi'iite jurist who was born in 242/856 and died in 323/935; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:541–6.

3 Abu 'l-Walid Hassān b. Muḥammad al-Qurashī al-Nisābūrī (d. 349/960) was also a famous Shāfi'iite jurist; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:492–6.

4 *Kifāya*, 424–5.

5 See above, p. 52.

3. The cases which fall between these two levels, like the addition of a word in a ḥadīth which the rest of those who related the ḥadīth do not give. An example is the ḥadīth Mālik related from Nāfi' from Ibn 'Umar "that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) placed the obligation of paying the alms tax of Ramaḍān on all men and women, free and slave, of the Muslims" (*'alā kull ḥurr aw 'abd dhakar aw unthā min al-muslimin*). Abū Ḥāfiẓ al-Tirmidhi said that Mālik was alone among reliable transmitters in relating it with the addition of the words "of the Muslims."<sup>6</sup> 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar,<sup>7</sup> Ayyūb [al-Sakhtiyāni] and others related this ḥadīth from Nāfi' from Ibn 'Umar without this addition. More than one expert, including Shāfi'i and Ahmad [b. Ḥanbal] (God be pleased with them) adopted the addition and cited it as a proof. God knows best.

Another example of that is the ḥadīth, "The Earth was made a mosque for us and its soil was made a purifier for us." Abū Mālik Sa'd b. Tāriq al-Ashja'i<sup>8</sup> was alone in giving this addition and the wording of the rest of the transmissions of the ḥadīth is, "The Earth was made a mosque and a purifier for us." This ḥadīth and similar ones resemble the first subcategory of addition in the respect that the version the group relates is general and the version the individual with the addition relates is specific. It contains an accidental difference and a species of contradiction which causes the legal rulings contained in the two versions to vary. It is also like the second subcategory in that there is no [fundamental] incompatibility between the two versions.

In the case of the addition which makes the loose ḥadīth cohesive (*ziyādat al-waṣl ma'a 'l-irsāl*), there is a contradiction similar to the one we mentioned above, between cohesion and looseness. That question grows in importance because looseness is a form of impugnment in a ḥadīth. Preference for the cohesive form and giving precedence to it is like giving a discrediting evaluation of a transmitter (*jarr*) precedence over an accrediting one (*ta'wil*). It is justified on the basis that discrediting is given precedence because it contains an "addition" of knowledge and the addition here belongs to the transmitter who gives the ḥadīth as cohesive.<sup>9</sup> God knows best.

6 *Sahih al-Tirmidhi*, 13:335–6 (K. al-Ilal).

7 Abū 'Uthmān 'Ubayd Allāh b. 'Umar b. Ḥafṣ al-'Umari (d. 144/761 or 145 or 147) was a descendant of the caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb and an important transmitter of ḥadīth in Medina; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:89.

8 Abū Mālik al-Ashja'i was a Kūfan scholar of ḥadīth who seems to be only poorly known. He took this particular transmission from the Follower Rib'i b. Ḥirāsh (d. ca. 90/709); Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:184–5.

9 That is, the discrediting critic is presumed to possess information impugning the transmitter's reliability unknown to his colleagues while the individual giving the isnād in cohesive form knows the identity of the additional transmitter whose inclusion renders the isnād whole.

Category 17  
ISOLATED ḤADĪTH  
*(Ma‘rifat al-afrād)*

---

The significant aspects of this Category have already been discussed in the immediately preceding Categories. Nevertheless, I have given this topic its own chapter, just as Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim did.<sup>1</sup> To cover what remains to be discussed on this topic, we say: isolated ḥadīth fall into the subcategories of absolutely isolated and isolated in relation to a particular aspect.

1. The first kind is the ḥadīth a single transmitter and no one else relates. Its subcategories and treatment have just been covered.
2. The second kind is isolated in a relative sense. For instance, the ḥadīth that a single *reliable* transmitter and no other *reliable* transmitter relates. This is virtually the same as the first subcategory. Other examples of this are the ḥadīth about which the following are said: “This is a ḥadīth which the Meccans” – or “the Syrians,” or “the Kūfans” or “the Khurāṣānians” – “and no one else relates;” or, “No one related it from X except Y,” – even if it was related through several lines of transmission from people other than X – or, “The Baṣrāns were alone in transmitting it from the Medinese,” or, “The Khurāṣānians were alone in transmitting it from the Meccans,” and the like. We will not cite examples of this subcategory at length since the matter can be understood without them. Nothing along these lines necessitates that the ḥadīth be judged as weak, unless someone applies the statements, “The Meccans were alone in transmitting it” – or, “The Baṣrāns were alone in transmitting it” – “from the Medinese,” or something like that, to a ḥadīth that only a single Meccan – or a single Baṣrāni, and so forth – related, ascribing the ḥadīth to [the scholars of the city as a group], in the way the deed of a single tribesman may be ascribed figuratively to the entire tribe. Indeed, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim did do this in the matter we are addressing.<sup>2</sup> [If this is the case,] the ḥadīth is treated in the same fashion as those in the first subcategory. God knows best.

---

1 ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 96–102.

2 According to Ibn Ḥajar, in all of al-Ḥākim’s examples it is a question of a single inhabitant of one city transmitting from a single inhabitant of another city, although al-Ḥākim described the transmission as, for instance, “the Baṣrāns from the Kūfans;” *Nukat*, 2:707.

## Category 18

### DEFECTIVE ḤADĪTH

*(Ma‘rifat al-ḥadīth al-mu‘allī)*

---

The scholars of ḥadīth call this kind of ḥadīth *ma‘lūl*. They use that construction, as do the jurists in reference to the subject of legal analogy: “the cause and the effect” (*al-qilla ma‘lūl*). The specialists in the Arabic language and lexicography disapprove of the construction *ma‘lūl*.

Be aware that the subject of the defects (*qilāl*) of ḥadīth is one of the most exalted, precise and noble of the sciences of ḥadīth. Only those possessing retention, experience and penetrating intelligence can become proficient in it. The defects consist of the hidden causes of impugnment in ḥadīth. A defective ḥadīth is one in which a defect impugning its soundness is detected, although it outwardly appears to be free of the defect. That may apply to an isnād made up of reliable transmitters which outwardly seems to fulfil the conditions of soundness.

Someone being alone in transmitting the ḥadīth as well as others contradicting him aid in catching the defect. Additionally, certain associated circumstances alert the expert in this matter to an occurrence of looseness in a connected ḥadīth (*irsāl fi ‘l-mawṣūl*), of halting in a raised ḥadīth (*waqf fi ‘l-marfū‘*), of the interpolation of one ḥadīth into another or of the commission of some other kind of mistake by someone. On the basis of these associated circumstances, the expert becomes suspicious about the ḥadīth and he either passes judgement [against it] because of them or hesitates, suspending judgement about the ḥadīth. All of these things, so long as they are present in a ḥadīth, prevent declaring it sound. Often they declare a connected ḥadīth to be defective on the basis of looseness. For instance, the ḥadīth appears with a connected isnād and it also appears with an interrupted isnād which is stronger [that is, better documented, and so forth] than the isnād of the connected version. For this reason, the books on the defects of ḥadīth include all of the chains of transmission of a ḥadīth. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “The way to discover the defect of a ḥadīth is to collect the lines of transmission, examine the differences of its transmitters and examine their position in regard to retention and their status in regard to exactitude and precision.” It is related that ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī said, “Chapter: If the lines of transmission of the ḥadīth are not gathered, its error will not become apparent.”

Sometimes – and this is more common – the defect occurs in the isnād and sometimes it occurs in the text. Sometimes the defect occurring in the isnād impugns the soundness of both the isnād and the text, as is the case when the defect of looseness and halting is detected. Sometimes the defect in the isnād impugns only the soundness of the isnād without impugning

the soundness of the text. The ḥadīth which the reliable transmitter Yaqīlā b. ‘Ubayd<sup>1</sup> related from Sufyān al-Thawrī from ‘Amr b. Dīnār from Ibn ‘Umar from the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Both of the parties in a sale have the option of refusal ...” is an example of a ḥadīth containing a defect in its isnād which does not impugn the soundness of the text. This is an isnād uninterrupted through the relation of one upright transmitter from another, yet it is defective and unsound. The text is in any case sound. The defect in the transmission is in Yaqīlā b. ‘Ubayd saying, “from ‘Amr b. Dīnār.” In fact, the ḥadīth is from ‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār from Ibn ‘Umar. The authoritative students of Sufyān al-Thawrī related it this way from him. Yaqīlā b. ‘Ubayd made a mistake, saying “‘Amr b. Dīnār” instead of “‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār,” both of whom are reliable.

An illustration of a defect in a text is the phrase making explicit the prohibition of reciting “In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate”, which Muslim was alone in including in the ḥadīth of Anas.<sup>2</sup> Some people regarded the relation of the aforementioned phrase as defective when they saw that the majority of transmitters merely said, “They used to commence their recitation with, ‘Praise be to God, the Lord of the Worlds,’ ” without any [explicit] objection to saying, “In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate,” and this is what Bukhārī<sup>3</sup> and Muslim were in agreement on including in their *Sahīh*. These people believed that the transmitter who related the ḥadīth with the aforementioned phrase [prohibiting the recitation of “In the name of God, and so forth”] paraphrased the text according to his understanding of it, and he understood Anas’ words, “They used to commence with ‘Praise be to God,’ to mean that they did not pronounce “In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate” and so the transmitter related the ḥadīth in the way he understood it. The person who did that erred, because the meaning of the ḥadīth is that the *sūra* [that is, chapter of the Qur’ān] they used to begin with was the *Fātiḥa*<sup>4</sup> and the [original] text of the ḥadīth contains no objection to saying, “In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate.” A number of other matters are relevant to that, including the fact that it is established that Anas was asked about commencing with “In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate” and he said that he did not have anything from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) on that topic. God knows best.

Be aware that the term “defect,” contrary to its original sense, is sometimes applied without qualification to the rest of the causes of impugnment – other

1 Yaqīlā b. ‘Ubayd (d. 209/825) was a well-respected Kūfan transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:476–7.

2 *Al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 2:12 (K. al-Ṣalāt). The additional passage which Muslim supplies is “lā yadhkurūna bismi ‘llāh al-Rahmān al-Rahīm fī amwāl qirā'a wa-lā fi ākhirihā.”

3 *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 1:192 (K. al-Adhān, B. Mā yuqrā'u ba'da 'l-takbīr).

4 *Fātiḥa* is the name of the first *sūra* of the Qur’ān. The second verse of the *Fātiḥa* is “Praise be to God, and so forth.” Reference to the second verse served to distinguish the *Fātiḥa* from the other *sūras*, because all but one of the *sūras* (the ninth) begin with “In the name of God, and so forth.”

than those we mentioned – which take ḥadīth from the state of soundness to the state of weakness and keep them from being acted upon. For that reason, you find in the books on the defects of ḥadīth a good deal of discrediting for falsehood, neglectfulness and carelessness and other similar types of discreditation. Tirmidhī even called abrogation a “defect” of ḥadīth. Indeed, one scholar<sup>5</sup> unqualifiedly applied the term “defect” to things which indisputably do not impugn – like someone transmitting as loose a ḥadīth which a reliable and precise transmitter gives as supported (*asnadahū*). He even said that the “defective sound” (*sahīh ma'lūl*) is one of the subcategories of the sound ḥadīth, just as someone else said that the “anomalous sound” (*sahīh shādhah*) is one of the forms of the sound ḥadīth. God knows best.

---

<sup>5</sup> Iraqi in *Taqyid* (p. 124) identified this individual as Abū Yaqā al-Khalili, who in fact did these things in his *Irshād*, 1:157, 160 ff.

## Category 19

### DISRUPTED ḤADITH

*(Ma‘rifat al-muḍṭarib min al-ḥadīth)*

---

A disrupted ḥadith is one transmitted in different forms. One of its transmitters relates it one way and another relates it a different way from the first. We call it “disrupted” only when the two transmissions are equal. If one of the two relations is preferable to the extent that the other can no longer stand up against it because its transmitter is more retentive, studied with the teacher longer or there exists some other cogent reason for favoring it, then the verdict is in favor of the preferable transmission. In that case, the ḥadith may not be characterized as “disrupted” without qualification and it is not treated in the same way. Sometimes the disruption occurs in the text of the ḥadith and sometimes in the isnād. Sometimes it comes from a single transmitter and sometimes it occurs among a number of its transmitters. Disruption makes a ḥadith weak, since it indicates that it was not accurately preserved. God knows best.

An example of this is the ḥadith we heard from Ismā‘il b. Umayya<sup>1</sup> from Abū ‘Amr b. Muḥammad b. Ḫurayth<sup>2</sup> from his grandfather Ḫurayth<sup>3</sup> from Abū Ḫurayra from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) concerning someone who wants to pray: “If he does not find a stick to plant in the ground in front of himself, let him draw a line on the ground.” Bishr b. al-Mufaddal<sup>4</sup> and Rawḥ b. al-Qāsim<sup>5</sup> related it from Ismā‘il that way. Sufyān al-Thawrī related it from Ismā‘il from Abū ‘Amr b. Ḫurayth from his father from Abū Ḫurayra. Ḫumayd b. al-Aswad<sup>6</sup> related it from Ismā‘il from Abū ‘Amr b. Muḥammad b. Ḫurayth b. Salim from his father from Abū Ḫurayra. Wuhayb<sup>7</sup> and ‘Abd al-Wārith<sup>8</sup> related it from Ismā‘il from Abū ‘Amr b. Ḫurayth from his grandfather Ḫurayth. ‘Abd al-Razzāq said, “Ibn Jurayj<sup>9</sup> said, ‘Ismā‘il

---

1 Ismā‘il b. Umayya b. ‘Amr al-Qurashi (d. 139/756) was considered to be a reliable transmitter of ḥadith; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):345–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):159.

2 I did not succeed in finding any information about this individual in the sources I consulted.

3 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):71–2; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):262.

4 Abū Ismā‘il Bishr b. al-Mufaddal al-Raqashī was a prominent Baṣrān transmitter who died in 186/802 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:36–9.

5 Abū Ghīyāth Rawḥ b. al-Qāsim al-Tamīmī al-‘Anbarī was a Baṣrān transmitter who died around 150/767; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:404.

6 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):357; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(1):218.

7 Abū Bakr Wuhayb b. Khālid b. ‘Ajlan al-Karabīsī (d. 165/782) was a Baṣrān ḥadīth expert; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:223–6.

8 Abū Ubayda ‘Abd al-Wārith b. Sa‘īd al-Tamīmī (102/721–180/796) was a well-regarded Baṣrān ḥadīth transmitter; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:300–4.

9 Abu ‘l-Walid (or Abū Khālid) ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Jurayj (80/699–150/767) was a Meccan expert in ḥadīth and law; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:91.

heard ḥadīth from Ḥurayth b. ‘Ammār from Abū Hurayra.’” This ḥadīth actually contains even more disruption than we have mentioned. God knows best.

Category 20

**MATERIAL INTERPOLATED INTO HADITH**

*(Ma‘rifat al-mudraj fi ’l-hadīth)*

---

There are several subcategories of interpolated material. One consists of the remarks of one of the transmitters of a ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) being interpolated into the ḥadīth itself. This happens because the Companion or someone later offered some of his own comments immediately after relating the ḥadīth and later transmitters related those comments as a continuation of the ḥadīth, without separating them by identifying the speaker. The matter is confusing for someone who does not know the reality of the situation and that person may erroneously believe that the entire text is from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).

A famous example of this is the ḥadīth we heard regarding the declaration of faith (*tashahhud*) from Abū Khaythama Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya<sup>1</sup> from al-Ḥasan b. al-Hurr<sup>2</sup> from al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymira<sup>3</sup> from ‘Alqama [b. Qays] from ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) taught him the way to make the declaration of faith in prayer. The Prophet said, “Say, ‘Greetings to God,’” and he gave the testimony of faith, concluding with, “I testify that there is no God but God and I testify that Muḥammad is the Messenger of God.” When you say this, you have completed your prayer. If you would like to get up, do so. If you would like to remain seated, do so.” Abū Khaythama related it that way from al-Ḥasan b. al-Hurr and he interpolated into the ḥadīth itself the remarks, “When you say this, and so forth.” These are in fact the words of Ibn Mas‘ūd and not the words of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). One of the indications of this is that the reliable and ascetic transmitter ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Thābit b. Thawbān<sup>4</sup> related it that way [that is, with an indication that the concluding remarks belonged to Ibn Mas‘ūd] from his transmitter al-Ḥasan b. al-Hurr. Ḥusayn al-Ju‘fī,<sup>5</sup>

---

1 Zuhayr b. Mu‘āwiya al-Ju‘fī (95/714–173/789) was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:181–7.

2 Al-Ḥasan b. al-Hurr (d. 133/751) was a wealthy Damascene scholar known for his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:152–3.

3 Abū ‘Urwa al-Qāsim b. Mukhaymira al-Hamdāni al-Kūfi (d. ca. 100/719) was born in al-Kūfa and moved to Damascus; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:201–4.

4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Thābit b. Thawbān al-‘Ansī al-Dimashqī (ca. 80/699–165/782) was a Damascene transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:313–14.

5 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali b. al-Walid al-Ju‘fī (119/737–203/819) was a transmitter famed for his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:397–401.

Ibn ‘Ajlān<sup>6</sup> and others concur in their relation from al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr on leaving out these remarks at the end of the ḥadīth. There is also agreement on this from all of those who related the declaration of faith from ‘Alqama and others from Ibn Maṣ‘ūd. Shabāba<sup>7</sup> related it from Abū Khaythamā and he also separated [the Prophet’s words from those of Ibn Maṣ‘ūd].<sup>8</sup>

Another subcategory of interpolated material is created when a transmitter has the text of a ḥadīth with a certain isnād, with the exception of a portion of the text which he has under another isnād, and his student interpolates the second portion of the text under the first isnād and omits the second isnād, relating all of it with the first isnād.

An illustration of this is the ḥadīth of [Sufyān] b. ‘Uyayna and Zā’ida b. Qudāma<sup>9</sup> from ‘Āṣim b. Kulayb<sup>10</sup> from his father<sup>11</sup> from Wā’il b. Hujr<sup>12</sup> concerning the description of the prayer of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), at the end of which we find: “He came in the winter and saw them raising their hands under their cloaks.” The correct version is the transmission of those who related from ‘Āṣim b. Kulayb under this isnād the description of the prayer by itself and kept separate from it the reference to their raising their hands. They related [the second part] from ‘Āṣim from ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Wā’il<sup>13</sup> from one of the members of his family from Wā’il b. Hujr.

Another kind of interpolated material is created when part of the text of a ḥadīth is interpolated into the text of *another* ḥadīth with a different isnād.

An illustration of this is the relation of Sa‘id b. Abī Maryam<sup>14</sup> from Mālik from Zuhrī from Anas in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Do not hate one another, do not envy one another, do not

6 The reliability of Abu ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Ajlān al-Qurashī (ca. 75/694–148/765) was disputed; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:317–22.

7 Abū ‘Amr Shabāba b. Sawwār al-Fazārī (ca. 130/748–206/822) was a transmitter of ḥadīth who died in Mecca; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:513–16.

8 See also al-Ḥakīm al-Nisābūrī, *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 39–40.

9 Abu ‘l-Ṣalt Zā’ida b. Qudāma al-Thaqafī al-Kūfi (d. 161/777) was a ḥadīth scholar who died while campaigning against the Byzantines; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:375–8.

10 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):487; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, *Jārh*, 3(1):349.

11 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):229; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, *Jārh*, 3(2):167.

12 Abū Hunaydah Wā’il b. Hujr b. Sa‘d was a Companion of the Prophet who settled in Iraq; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:572–4.

13 ‘Abd al-Jabbār b. Wā’il b. Hujr is said to have transmitted from his father through the intermediary of his brother ‘Alqama; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):106–7; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, *Jārh*, 3(1):30–1.

14 Abū Muḥammad Sa‘id b. Abī Maryam al-Ḥakam al-Miṣrī (144/761–224/839) was considered one of the finest of the Egyptian transmitters of his era; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:327–30.

oppose one another and do not compete against one another ..." Ibn Abi Maryam interpolated into it the words, "do not compete against one another," from the text of another ḥadīth which Mālik related from Abu 'l-Zinād from al-A'raj from Abū Hurayra containing, "Do not snoop, do not pry, do not compete against one another and do not envy one another." God knows best.

Another kind of interpolated material is created when a transmitter relates a ḥadīth from a number of teachers who give different isnāds for it, and does not mention the difference, instead putting the isnāds together as a single isnād.

An illustration of this is the transmission of 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi<sup>15</sup> and Muḥammad b. Kathir al-'Abdī<sup>16</sup> from [Sufyān] al-Thawrī from Maṇṣūr,<sup>17</sup> al-A'mash and Wāṣil al-Aḥdab<sup>18</sup> from Abū Wā'il<sup>19</sup> from 'Amr b. Shurahbil<sup>20</sup> from Ibn Mas'ūd: "I said, 'Messenger of God, which sin is the gravest ...?'" Wāṣil related it from Abū Wā'il from 'Abd Allāh [b. Mas'ūd] without mentioning 'Amr b. Shurahbil between them. God knows best.

Be aware that it is not permissible to practice any form of the aforementioned interpolation deliberately. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb has written a book entitled *al-Faṣl li-'l-waṣl al-mudraj fi 'l-naql (The Separation of Hadīth Combined through Interpolation in the Course of Transmission)*<sup>21</sup> on this category of ḥadīth, which adequately covers the subject. God knows best.

<sup>15</sup> Abū Sa'īd 'Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Mahdi (135/752–198/813) was a Baṣrān expert in ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:192–209.

<sup>16</sup> Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Kathir al-'Abdī al-Baṣrī appears to be only poorly known. He is said to have died in 223/838, at about the age of 90; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:383–4.

<sup>17</sup> Abū 'Attāb Maṇṣūr b. al-Mu'tamir al-Sulamī (d. 132/750) was an important transmitter of ḥadīth in al-Kūfā; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:402–12.

<sup>18</sup> Wāṣil b. Ḥayyān al-Asadī al-Aḥdab was a Kūfan who died in 120/738; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):171; Ibn Abī Hatim, *Jārh*, 4(2):29–30.

<sup>19</sup> Abū Wā'il Shaqiq b. Salama al-Asadī (d. 82/701) was said to have been the greatest Kūfan expert in the ḥadīth of Ibn Mas'ūd; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:161–6.

<sup>20</sup> Abū Maysara 'Amr b. Shurahbil al-Hamdānī was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 70/689; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:135–6.

<sup>21</sup> Ed. Muḥammad b. Maṭar al-Zahrānī, 2 vols (Riyadh, 1418/1997).

**Category 21**  
**FORGED ḤADĪTH**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-mawdū‘)*

---

The forged ḥadīth is the fabricated, made-up ḥadīth. Be aware that the forged ḥadīth is the worst kind of the weak ḥadīth. It is not permissible under any circumstance for someone who is aware that a ḥadīth is forged to relate it, unless coupled with a declaration that it is forged. This is different from the other kinds of weak ḥadīth – which may possibly be fundamentally truthful – in as much as it is permissible to transmit the other kinds of weak ḥadīth to instil virtue and inspire fear (*al-taghrīb wa-’l-tarhib*), as we will explain shortly, God (He is exalted) willing.

A ḥadīth can be known to be forged only by the acknowledgement of its forger or something equivalent to his acknowledgement. Sometimes scholars come to recognize a forgery by inference from the state of the transmitter or that of the report he transmits. The feebleness of the words and sense of some long ḥadīth bear witness to the fact that they were forged. Indeed, the individual<sup>1</sup> who in our time collected *al-Mawdū‘āt* ([Book of] Forged Hadīth) in roughly two volumes did this a lot and he included many ḥadīth without proof of their having been forged. He should have mentioned them only under the general designation of weak ḥadīth.

There are different types of forgers of ḥadīth. The greatest of them in terms of the harm they do are some of those considered to be ascetics who forge ḥadīth supporting their claims in expectation of a heavenly reward. The people accept their forgeries, putting their faith in these forgers and relying on them. Later – Praise be to God! – the great critics of ḥadīth resolutely took on the task of exposing the defectiveness of these ḥadīth and obliterating their disgrace. One of the things we heard from the authority Abū Bakr al-Sam‘ānī<sup>2</sup> is that some of the Karrāmites<sup>3</sup> held the doctrine that it was permissible to forge ḥadīth for the sake of instilling virtue and inspiring fear.

The forger sometimes made up the remarks himself and related them [as a ḥadīth] and sometimes took the words of a wise man or someone else and falsely ascribed them to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Sometimes someone erred and unintentionally fell into something close to forgery, as happened to the

---

1 This appears to be another reference to Abu ’l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī and his *Kitāb al-Mawdū‘āt*, see Ibn Hajar, *Nukat*, 2:847–8 and Laknawī, *Ajwiba*, 164.

2 The scholar Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Sam‘ānī (467/1074–510/1116) was the son of Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Manṣūr; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 19:371–3.

3 The Karrāmites were a sect following the doctrines of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Karrām (ca. 190/806–255/869) which enjoyed prominence in Iran until the Mongol invasion; *EF*, 4:667–9.

ascetic Thabit b. Müsa<sup>4</sup> in the ḥadīth, “The face of whoever prays much at night becomes beautiful in the day.”

Another example: We heard that Abū Ṭisma – and he is Nūḥ b. Abī Maryam<sup>5</sup> – was asked, “Where did you get the ḥadīth from ‘Ikrima<sup>6</sup> from Ibn ‘Abbās concerning the magical properties (*safā’iḥ*) of each *sūra* of the Qur’ān?” He said, “I saw that the people had turned their backs on the Qur’ān and had come to occupy themselves with Abū Ḥanīfa’s legal doctrines and Muḥammad b. Iṣhāq’s<sup>7</sup> stories of the Prophet’s campaigns, so I forged these ḥadīth as a way to gain favor with God.” The same is true of the long ḥadīth which is related<sup>8</sup> from ‘Ubayy b. Ka'b<sup>9</sup> from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) which describes the magical property of the Qur’ān *sūra* by *sūra*. One researcher investigated its source until he reached someone who confessed that he and a group of others had forged it; and indeed the mark of a forgery is clearly upon it. The truth is that the commentator Wāhiḍī<sup>9</sup> and the other commentators who mention it have made a mistake in including it in their commentaries. God knows best.

<sup>4</sup> According to Ibn Ḥibbān, the judge Sharīk b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Nakha‘ī (95/713–177/794) uttered the words in question immediately after reciting a ḥadīth and it was the Kufān Abū Ismā‘il (or Abū Yazīd) Thabit b. Müsa who mistakenly interpreted them as belonging to the Prophet; *Kitāb al-Majrūḥin min al-muhaddithin wa-’l-du’afā’ wa-’l-matrūkin*, ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid, 3 vols (Mecca, n.d.), 1:207.

<sup>5</sup> Abū Ṭisma Nūḥ b. Abī Maryam al-Marwazī (d. 173/789) served as the *qādī* of Marv and was a severe critic of the Jahmites; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 4(1):484; Ibn Ḥibbān, *Majrūḥin*, 3:48–9; Dhahabi, *Mizān al-i’tidāl*, 4:279–80, see also 4:275–6, no. 9131; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān al-mizān*, 6:172–3, no. 609.

<sup>6</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Ikrima b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Barbarī al-Madāni (d. ca. 105/723) was a slave belonging to ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:12–36.

<sup>7</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Iṣhāq b. Yasār (ca. 85/704–ca. 150/767) was the author of the most famous biography of the Prophet, commonly known as *Sīrat Ibni Iṣhāq*; *EP*, 3:810–11; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:288–90.

<sup>8</sup> Ubayy b. Ka'b was one of the most famous Companions of the Prophet; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 1:389–402.

<sup>9</sup> Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Wāhiḍī (d. 468/1075) wrote a number of works of Qur’ānic exegesis; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:524, *Suppl.*, 1:730–31.

Category 22  
MIXED-UP ḤADITH  
(*Ma‘rifat al-maqlūb*)

---

An example of a mixed-up ḥadīth would be, for instance, a ḥadīth well known from Sālim which was made to be from Nāfi‘ so that it would thereby become rare and desirable. Similar to this is the account we heard of Bukhārī’s (God be pleased with him) arrival in Baghdad. Before his class some of the scholars of ḥadīth met together and took one hundred ḥadīth and mixed up their texts and isnāds. They attached the text of one isnād to the isnād of another and the isnād of that text to the text of another. Then they went to Bukhārī’s class and presented the ḥadīth to him. When they finished presenting these mixed-up ḥadīth to him, Bukhārī turned to them and restored each text to its proper isnād and each isnād to its text. They conceded his superiority.

An example of this – and it also serves as an example of a defective ḥadīth (*mu‘allal*) – is the ḥadīth we heard from Ishaq b. Īsā [b.] al-Tabba‘.<sup>1</sup> He said, Jarir b. Hāzim<sup>2</sup> informed us from Thābit<sup>3</sup> from Anas that he said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘When the second call to prayer is given, do not stand up until you see me.’” Ishaq b. Īsā said, “I went to Hammād b. Zayd<sup>4</sup> and asked him about the ḥadīth. He said, ‘Abu ’l-Naḍr [Jarir b. Hāzim] was mistaken. We were all in the class of Thābit al-Bunānī and Hajjāj b. Abī Uthmān<sup>5</sup> was with us. Hajjāj al-Şawwāf transmitted to us from Yahyā b. Abī Kathir<sup>6</sup> from ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Qatāda<sup>7</sup> from his father<sup>8</sup> that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘When the second call to prayer is given, do not stand up until you see me.’” Abu ’l-Naḍr – that is Jarir b. Hāzim – thought that it was one of the ḥadīth Thābit related to us from Anas.” God knows best.

---

1 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabr*, 1(1):399; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, 1(1):230–1.

2 Abu ’l-Naḍr Jarir b. Hāzim al-Baṣrī (85/704–170/786) was an early historian and transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:310–11.

3 Abu Muhammād Thābit b. Aslam al-Bunānī was a Follower who died in al-Baṣra around 123/741; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:220–5.

4 Abu Ismā‘il Hammād b. Zayd b. Dirham (d. 179/795) was one of the great ḥadīth critics in al-Baṣra; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:456–64.

5 Hajjāj b. Abī Uthmān al-Şawwāf was a Baṣrāni transmitter who died in 143/760; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:75.

6 Abū Naṣr Yahyā b. Abī Kathir (d. 129/747) was considered one of the great ḥadīth scholars of his age. His father’s *ism* was disputed; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:27–31.

7 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabr*, 3(1):175–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarḥ*, 2(2):32.

8 Abū Qatāda al-Jāridh b. Rib‘i al-Salāmī was a Companion who died in 54/674 at the age of seventy, in either Medina or al-Kūfa. His *ism* is alternately given as al-Nu‘mān or ‘Amr; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:449–56.

Section: We have now fulfilled our earlier promise to elucidate the types of weak ḥadīth. (God be praised.) Let us now point out some important matters.

1. When you see a ḥadīth with a weak isnād, you should say, “This is weak,” and mean that it is weak with that isnād. You should not say, “This is weak,” and merely on the basis of the weakness of that particular isnād mean by this that the text is weak. For sometimes a ḥadīth is also related with a sound isnād of the kind which establishes a ḥadīth as sound. Rather, the permissibility of declaring a text to be weak rests on one of the authorities of ḥadīth ruling that it was not related with an isnād which establishes it as sound or ruling that it really is a weak ḥadīth – or something similar to that – and explaining the reason for impugning it. Some remarks will come – God (He is exalted) willing – about the case when an authority makes a general declaration that a ḥadīth is weak without providing an explanation. Note this for it is an area in which mistakes are made. God knows best.
2. In the opinion of the scholars of ḥadīth and others, some laxity is tolerated in the provision of isnāds and in the transmission of ḥadīth from the various categories of weak ḥadīth – with the exception of forged ḥadīth – without bothering to explain their weakness. This applies in topics other than the characteristics of God (He is exalted) and legal rulings concerning the permitted and forbidden, and so forth. It is valid, for instance, for sermons, stories, the descriptions of the rewards associated with the performance of various religious acts, the other types of ḥadīth inspiring virtue and instilling fear, and the ḥadīth on other matters having no connection to legal rulings and theological issues. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with them) are some of those we heard from who totally forbade laxity in ḥadīth like these.
3. If you want to relate a weak ḥadīth without an isnād, do not use, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” or similar phrases that definitely indicate that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said the words. Instead, you should say for it, “It is related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), such and such,” “We read from him such and such,” “It arrived from him,” “It came from him,” “Some of them related,” or something similar to that. That is the way you should handle a ḥadīth the soundness and weakness of which you are in doubt about. You should say, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said,” only for the ḥadīth the soundness of which has become clear to you in the way we elucidated above. God knows best.

## Category 23

### THE CHARACTERISTIC OF THOSE WHOSE TRANSMISSION IS ACCEPTED AND THOSE WHOSE TRANSMISSION IS REJECTED, AND THE ALLIED SUBJECTS OF IMPUGNING AND DISCREDITING, AND CERTIFYING AND ACCREDITING

(*Ma'rifat şifat man tuqbalu riwāyatuhū wa-man turaddu  
riwāyatuhū wa-mā yata'allaqu bi-dhālika min qadḥ  
wa-jarḥ wa-tawthiq wa-ta'dil*)

The generality of the experts in ḥadīth and law unanimously agree on stipulating that the person whose transmission may be adduced as a proof be upright (*'adl*) and accurate (*dābiṭ*) in what he relates. Specifically, he must be Muslim; adult; of sound mind; free of tendencies toward impiety and defects of character; alert; careful; retentive, if he transmits from memory; and accurate in handling his text, if he transmits from it. If he paraphrases his ḥadīth in transmission (*yuhaddithu bi-'l-ma'na*), it is further stipulated that he be aware of any way the sense of a text can be altered. (God knows best.) We will clarify this general statement by addressing specific issues.

1. The integrity of a transmitter is sometimes established by an explicit endorsement of his integrity (*'adāla*) by those who accredit him and sometimes by general acknowledgement. For those whose integrity is well known to the transmitters of ḥadīth and other scholars like them and who are widely praised for reliability and honesty, there is no need for evidence testifying to their reliability in the form of an explicit declaration. This is held to be correct in the doctrine of Shāfi'i and it is relied upon in the field of legal theory (*uṣūl al-fiqh*). The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb is one of the scholars of ḥadīth who stated this. He cited<sup>1</sup> as examples of this [exalted status] Mālik, Shu'ba, the two Sufyāns [that is, Sufyān al-Thawrī and Sufyān b. 'Uyayna], Awzā'i,<sup>2</sup> al-Layth,<sup>3</sup> Ibn al-Mubārak,<sup>4</sup> Waki'<sup>5</sup>, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, Yahyā b. Ma'īn, 'Ali b. al-Madīnī and those who were like them in terms of renown and righteousness. The integrity of these scholars and those like

1 *Kifāya*, 86–7.

2 Abū 'Amr 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Amr al-Awzā'i (ca. 88/707–157/774) was an important early Syrian legal scholar; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:516–17.

3 Abu 'l-Ḥārith al-Layth b. Sa'īd al-Miṣrī al-Fahmī (94/713–175/791) was an important Egyptian legal scholar; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:520.

4 Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Marwazī al-Ḥanẓalī (118/736–181/797) played an important role in the development of Islamic mīsticism; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:95; *EIr*, 1:184–5.

5 Abū Sufyān Waki' b. al-Jarrāḥ (129/746–197/812) was a famous Kūfān scholar of ḥadīth, Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:96–7.

them is not questioned. Those whose affair is hidden from researchers are the only ones whose reliability may be questioned. The expert Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr made a sweeping declaration on this point: “Every bearer of ḥadīth known to be attentive in this matter is considered to be upright and his integrity is assumed indefinitely until a reason for his discreditation comes to light, because the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said, ‘The upright people of each succeeding generation will bear this knowledge.’”<sup>6</sup> There is some unsatisfactory vagueness in what Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said. God knows best.

2. A transmitter comes to be recognized as accurate by the comparison of his transmissions with the transmissions of reliable scholars known for precision and exactitude. If we find that his transmissions are in agreement – even if only from the standpoint of sense – with their transmissions or that they are largely in agreement and disagreement is rare, then we know that he is accurate and trustworthy (*thabat*). If we find that he often contradicts them, we discover his imprecision and we do not adduce his ḥadīth as proofs. God knows best.

3. According to the sound and well-known doctrine, accreditation may be accepted without any statement of a reason for it, because the reasons for accrediting a transmitter are numerous and difficult to state. To demand the reasons would require the accrediter to say, “He did not do X, he did not commit Y and he did do Z,” and enumerate everything the commission or omission of which is impious, and that would be very burdensome.

Discrediting may not be accepted without a clear explanation of the reason, because people disagree over what discredits and what does not. Sometimes a critic discredits someone on the basis of a matter that he believes to discredit, but which does not do so in reality. He must explain his reason in order that it be seen whether it is discrediting or not. This is clearly established in the fields of positive law and legal theory. The expert al-Khaṭīb said<sup>7</sup> that it is the doctrine of the authorities of the experts and critics of ḥadīth, like Bukhārī, Muslim and others. For that reason, Bukhārī adduced as proofs the ḥadīth of a number of transmitters whom others had previously discredited, like Ikrīma – the slave of Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them) – Ismā‘il b. Abī Uways,<sup>8</sup> ‘Āsim b. ‘Alī,<sup>9</sup> ‘Amr b. Marzūq<sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Tamhid*, 1:28, 59.

<sup>7</sup> Some assert that the proper vocalization of this term is “*thabt*;” see, for example, Lakanwi, *al-Raf‘ wa-l-takmila fi ‘l-jarḥ wa-l-ta‘dil*, ed. ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Abu Ghudda (Aleppo, n.d.), 66.

<sup>8</sup> *Kifāya*, 108–9.

<sup>9</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh Ismā‘il b. Abī Uways al-Asbahī (139/756–226/841) was a nephew of the imām Mālik and a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth in Medina; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:391–5.

<sup>10</sup> ‘Āsim b. ‘Alī b. ‘Āsim (d. 221/836) was most famous for being a transmitter from Shu‘ba b. al-Hajjāj; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:262–5.

<sup>11</sup> Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Amr b. Marzūq al-Baṣrī (ca. 130/747–224/839) was a prominent but controversial transmitter in al-Baṣra; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:417–20.

and others. Muslim cited as proofs the ḥadīth of Suwayd b. Sa‘īd<sup>12</sup> and a number of others who were widely impugned. Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī did the same. This indicates that they held the doctrine that discrediting is not established unless the reason for it is explained.

The views of the critics of ḥadīth transmitters [regarding discrediting] are obscure and contradictory. Al-Khaṭīb composed a chapter<sup>13</sup> containing some stories about those who were asked to explain why they discredited someone and gave invalid reasons for it. In one Shu‘ba was asked, “Why did you forsake the ḥadīth of X?” He said, “I saw him galloping on an old nag, so I rejected his ḥadīth.” In another, Muslim b. Ibrāhīm<sup>14</sup> was asked about the ḥadīth of al-Šalīḥ al-Murri.<sup>15</sup> He said, “What can be done with Šalīḥ? One day they mentioned his name to Hammād b. Salama and Hammād blew his nose.” God knows best.

What if someone says, “For discrediting transmitters and rejecting their ḥadīth, people rely on the books which the authorities in ḥadīth wrote on impugning or on personality criticism in general (*al-jarh wa-‘l-ta‘dil*), and rarely do these authorities venture to explain their reasons in them. Rather, they confine themselves merely to saying, ‘X is weak,’ ‘Y is nothing,’ and the like, or ‘This is a weak ḥadīth,’ ‘This is not a well-established ḥadīth,’ and the like. So stipulating that the reason must be explained leads to the negation of [the value of their opinions] and to the invalidation of the discrediting in most cases”? The answer to this is that, even if we do not rely on these kinds of declarations to assert discreditation and pass judgement, we do rely upon them to the extent that we refrain from accepting the ḥadīth of those whom they say something like that about, on the basis that these declarations have sown in our mind doubts about the transmitters of the kind which necessitate hesitation. If the doubts of the authorities about a transmitter are removed by an investigation of his state which necessitates that we trust his integrity, we accept his ḥadīth without hesitation. This is the case of those whom the authors of the two *Šaḥīhs* and others cite who were touched by this kind of discreditation from other critics. So understand that, for it is a good counter-argument. God knows best.

4. There are conflicting opinions over the question of whether a judgement of personality criticism is established as valid by the statement of a single critic, or whether two are necessary. Some maintain that two is the minimum number to

12 The controversial transmitter Abū Muḥammad Suwayd b. Sa‘īd b. Sahl al-Ḥadathānī died in al-Ḥadītha in 240/854 at about one hundred years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:410–20.

13 *Kifāya*, 110–14.

14 Abū ‘Amr Muslim b. Ibrāhīm al-Azdi was an important transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 222/836; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:103.

15 Abū Bishr al-Šalīḥ b. Bashir al-Murri (d. ca. 172/788) was a storyteller and preacher in al-Baṣra whose reliability was disputed; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:46–8.

establish such a criticism, as is the case with the discreditation and accreditation of testimony in court. Some hold the opinion – and it is the correct view, which Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb<sup>16</sup> and others have adopted – that it may be established by a single critic. Because no particular number of transmitters is stipulated for the acceptance of a report,<sup>17</sup> none is stipulated for the accrediting or discrediting of a transmitter, contrary to the case of testimony in court. God knows best.

5. If a single individual is both discredited and accredited, the discreditation takes precedence because the critic who accredits him reports on his apparent state and the one who discredits him reports on a real matter which was hidden from the critic who accredited him. It is said that if the number of critics accrediting him is greater [than the number of those discrediting him], the accreditation deserves precedence. The correct view – and that held by the majority – is that the discrediting takes precedence, for the reason we gave. God knows best.

6. A declaration of accreditation made in an obscure fashion, without giving the name of the person who is being accredited, is not enough. According to what the expert al-Khaṭīb,<sup>18</sup> the jurist Ṣayrafi [that is, Abū Bakr al-Shāfi‘ī] and others stated, when a transmitter says, “A reliable person transmitted to me,” or something similar to that, limiting himself to such a statement, it is not sufficient. This is contrary to the view of others who do accept this as sufficient. A declaration made in an obscure fashion is rejected because the individual may be reliable in the opinion of that person, while someone else may have come across something that, either in his opinion alone or by consensus, discredits him. So it is necessary for the transmitter to name his teacher so that his identity can be determined. Indeed, his avoidance of naming the transmitter is itself a suspicious act, which sows doubt about him in the heart of others. If the individual who says, “[A reliable transmitter related to me,” and so forth] is a scholar, his declaration may be sufficient for those who share his views [on personality criticism], according to the opinion adopted by some thorough scholars. The expert al-Khaṭīb said, “When a scholar says, ‘Everyone I relate from is reliable, even if do not name him,’ and he then relates ḥadīth from someone whom he does not name, he is in fact vouching for that person’s blamelessness. However, we do not act on this testimony of his blamelessness.”<sup>19</sup> This is because of the reason we presented above. God knows best.

16 *Kifāya*, 96–7.

17 The reference here is to the *khabar al-wāhid*, the ḥadīth related at some point in its line of transmission by a single individual. As Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ stated above (p. 5), it was debated, especially in the first centuries of Islam, whether such a ḥadīth could be accepted. For a general discussion, see James Robson, “Traditions from Individuals,” *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 9 (1964):327–40.

18 This would seem to be a reference to *Kifāya*, 92, although the issue addressed there is not identical.

19 *Kifāya*, 92.

7. In the opinion of the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth and others, when an upright individual relates from a transmitter and gives his name, his relation from that transmitter is not tantamount to his accreditation of him. Some of the adherents of ḥadīth and some of the Shāfi'ites said that this does constitute his accreditation of that individual, because his accreditation is inherent in his transmitting from him. The correct view is the first, because it is permissible for someone to relate from a transmitter who is not upright, without his relation from him entailing his accreditation of him.

In the same way, we may say that the action of a scholar or his issuance of a legal opinion in accordance with a particular ḥadīth does not constitute a judgement from him that the ḥadīth is sound. Likewise, his contradiction of [what is prescribed in] the ḥadīth is not equivalent to his impugning the soundness of the ḥadīth itself or the person who transmitted it. God knows best.

8. Concerning the relation of an unknown transmitter (*majhūl*): for our present purposes, there are several types of unknown people:

- (a). The transmitter whose apparent integrity and real integrity are both unknown: in the view of the majority, his transmissions may not be accepted. This is in accordance with the opinion to which we earlier drew attention.<sup>20</sup>
- (b). The unknown transmitter whose real integrity is unknown, although he is apparently upright and outwardly acceptable (*mastūr*): one of our authorities has said, “The outwardly acceptable transmitter is someone who is apparently upright but whose real integrity is not known.” Some of those who reject the transmission of the first type of unknown person, adduce as proofs the transmission of this type. This is the doctrine of some of the Shāfi'ites. One of them who stated it plainly is the authority Sulaym b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī:<sup>21</sup> “Because the question of reports is based on giving the transmitter the benefit of the doubt and because the transmission of reports is in the hands of those who are incapable of gaining knowledge of a transmitter’s real integrity, limit yourself in regard to reports to knowledge of the transmitter’s apparent integrity. Reports differ from testimony in court, for the latter is before judges and they are not incapable of [discovering a witness’s real integrity], so for testimony in court analyze a witness’s apparent and real integrity.” It seems that this view was acted upon in many of the famous books of ḥadīth in regard to a number of the transmitters who lived before the authors of the books and about whom it was impossible to obtain real first-hand knowledge. God knows best.

<sup>20</sup> This seems to be a reference to the discussion in section six.

<sup>21</sup> Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Sulaym b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī (ca. 360/971–447/1055) was a well-traveled Shāfi'ite scholar; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:645–7.

(c). The transmitter whose identity is unknown: those who do not accept the relation of a transmitter whose identity is unknown do sometimes accept the relation of a transmitter whose integrity is unknown. Someone whom two upright transmitters relate ḥadīth from and identify [that is, name] is not considered “unknown” in this sense. In response to some questions he was asked, Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī said, “In the view of the scholars of ḥadīth an unknown transmitter is everyone whom the scholars do not know and whose ḥadīth are only known from the line of transmission of a single student. Examples are ‘Amr Dhū Murr,<sup>22</sup> Jābbār al-Tā’i<sup>23</sup> and Sa’id b. Dhi Huddān,<sup>24</sup> from whom only Abū Ishāq al-Sabi’i transmitted; al-Hazhāz b. Mayzan,<sup>25</sup> from whom Shābi is the sole transmitter; and Jurayy b. Kulayb,<sup>26</sup> from whom only Qatāda transmitted.”<sup>27</sup> In reality Sufyān al-Thawrī also transmitted from al-Hazhāz. Al-Khaṭīb went on, “Infrequently it does happen that the label of ‘unknown’ is lifted from a transmitter by two scholars famous in ḥadīth transmitting from him. However, the verdict that he is upright is not established by their relation from him.”<sup>28</sup> This is something which we explained above.<sup>29</sup> (God knows best.) Bukhārī included in his *Saḥīḥ* the ḥadīth of a number of people from whom only one student related, including Mirdās al-Aslāmī,<sup>30</sup> from whom only Qays b. Abī Hāzim<sup>31</sup> transmitted. Likewise, Muslim included the ḥadīth of a number of people from whom only a single student transmitted, including Rabi’ā b. Ka'b al-Aslāmī,<sup>32</sup> from whom only Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān transmitted. When Bukhārī or Muslim include the ḥadīth of a transmitter, he may leave the state he was in of being unknown and rejected because only a single student related from him. The opposing view on that follows the previously cited line of argumentation known to have been made against the view that the statement of a single critic is enough to accredit a transmitter.<sup>33</sup> God knows best.

9. There is disagreement over whether to accept the relation of a sectarian (*mubtadi’*) who does not become an infidel (*lā yakfuru*) through his adherence to

22 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):329–30; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):232.

23 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):252; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):543.

24 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):470–71; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(1):19.

25 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):250–51; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):122.

26 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):244; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):536–7.

27 *Kifāya*, 88.

28 *Kifāya*, 88–9.

29 See section seven.

30 Mirdās b. Mālik al-Aslāmī seems to have been a Companion of the Prophet; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):434; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):350; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1386.

31 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Qays b. Abī Hāzim Huṣayn b. ‘Awf (d. ca. 98/717) was a Kūfan Follower of the Prophet whose transmissions were considered controversial; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:198–202.

32 Abū Firās Rabi’ā b. Ka'b al-Aslāmī was a Companion of the Prophet; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):280; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):472.

33 See section four.

his sectarian doctrine (*bid'a*). Some flatly reject his transmission, arguing that he becomes a wrongdoer (*fāsiq*) because of his sectarian doctrine. [They argue that] just as the person who arrives at his false doctrine through interpretation and the person who does not<sup>34</sup> are equal in sectarianism, they are also equal in wrongdoing.

Some accept the transmission of a sectarian, if he is not someone who views as licit telling lies to further his doctrine or for the sake of the adherents of his doctrine, irrespective of whether he is a proselytizer (*dā'iya*) for his sectarian doctrine or not. Some scholars ascribed this view to Shāfi'i on the basis of his statement, "Accept the testimony of sectarians (*ahl al-ahwā'*), except the Shiites Khaṭṭābites<sup>35</sup> since they view as licit testifying falsely in favor of those who agree with them."<sup>36</sup>

Some people say that the sectarian's transmission is to be accepted, if he is not a proselytizer; and it is not to be accepted, if he is a proselytizer for his sectarian belief. This is the doctrine of many – or most – scholars. One of the followers of Shāfi'i (God be pleased with him) told of a disagreement among the imām's followers over the acceptance of the transmission of a sectarian, when he does not proselytize for his sectarian doctrine. Shāfi'i said, "If he is a proselytizer, there is no disagreement among them that his transmission is not to be accepted." Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī – one of the authorities of ḥadīth who wrote books – said, "According to our authorities, it is absolutely forbidden to cite the ḥadīth of a proselytizer for sectarian doctrines. I do not know of any disagreement among them on this point."<sup>37</sup> This third view is the most just and the most preferable. The first is unlikely and far from the one common among the authorities in ḥadīth. Their books overflow with the transmissions of sectarians who were not proselytizers and there are many of their ḥadīth in the two *Sahīhs*, both as supporting attestations and primary texts.

10. The transmitter who repents from telling lies in the ḥadīth of the people and from other forms of wrongdoing: his transmission is accepted, unless he is repenting from deliberately lying in the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), in which case his transmission may never be accepted, even if his repentance is sincere. This is in accord with what is repeated from several

<sup>34</sup> *Al-muta'awwil wa-ghayr al-muta'awwil*: The difference seems to be that the first arrived at his false doctrine through a mistaken but "permissible and obvious interpretation" while the second is "in clear opposition to the fundamental principles of the *sunna*"; Sakhāwi, *Fath al-Mughith*, 1:303.

<sup>35</sup> The Khaṭṭābites were an extremist Shiite sect named after Abu 'l-Khaṭṭāb al-Asadi, who led an uprising against the 'Abbasids in al-Kūfa and was executed around the year 138/755. Little is known about the doctrines of the Khaṭṭābites, although they seem to have continued as a religious movement for some time after the death of the founder; *EP*, 4:1132–3.

<sup>36</sup> *Kifāya*, 120.

<sup>37</sup> For similar sentiments, see Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Thiqāt* (Hyderabad, 1973 ff.), 6:140–1 and *Majrūḥīn*, 1:81–4.

scholars, including Ahmad b. Hanbal and Abū Bakr al-Humaydī,<sup>38</sup> the teacher of Bukhārī. We found that the authority Abū Bakr [al-Shāfi‘ī] al-Şayrafi made a general declaration in his commentary on Shāfi‘ī’s *Risāla*: “We may never again accept the ḥadīth of any transmitter who has a report we reject because of a falsehood we found to his discredit, even if it appears that he repented. Once we rate someone’s transmission as weak, we may not deem it strong later.” He mentioned that this is one of the points where testifying in court and transmitting ḥadīth differ. The authority Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar al-Sam‘ānī al-Marwāzī said that all of the ḥadīth which come from someone who lied in even a single report must be rejected. This is similar in sense to what Şayrafi said. God knows best.

11. When one reliable transmitter relates a ḥadīth and the [alleged] teacher of the ḥadīth is consulted and he disavows it: the preferred way of viewing the situation is that if the teacher is unambiguous in his disavowal, saying “I did not relate it,” “He fathered a lie on me,” or something similar to that; the two definite statements [that is, the student’s ascription of the ḥadīth to the teacher and the teacher’s disavowal] are incompatible and the teacher who denies the ḥadīth is the first-hand source. Thus it is necessary to reject the ḥadīth of the second-hand source. This does not discredit the student in a fashion which necessitates the rejection of the rest of his ḥadīth, because he also calls his teacher a liar in the matter of the disputed ḥadīth. His teacher’s discreditation of him is not more worthy of being accepted than his discreditation of his teacher, so they both fall away.

If the teacher from whom the ḥadīth is related says, “I do not know it,” “I do not remember it,” or something similar to that; it does not necessitate the rejection of the transmission of his student. Among the generality of ḥadīth scholars, legal scholars and speculative theologians, a teacher relating a ḥadīth and then forgetting it does not constitute a reason not to act upon it. This is contrary to the view of some of the Ḥanafites who hold that the ḥadīth must be rejected because of that.

On this they base their rejection of the ḥadīth of Sulaymān b. Mūsā<sup>39</sup> from Zuhri from ‘Urwa from ‘Ā’isha from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): “When a woman marries without the permission of her guardian, the marriage is invalid ...” That is because Ibn Jurayj said, “I met Zuhri and I asked him about this ḥadīth and he did not know it.”

38 Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr al-Humaydī (d. 219/834) was an important transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:101–2.

39 Sulaymān b. Mūsā al-Dimashqī (d. 119/737) was a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:433–7.

Similar to this is the ḥadīth of Rabi‘at al-Ra‘y<sup>40</sup> from Suhayl b. Abī Ṣalīḥ<sup>41</sup> from his father<sup>42</sup> from Abū Hurayra to the effect that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ruled in a legal dispute on the basis of a single witness and an oath. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Muḥammad al-Darāwirdī<sup>43</sup> said, “I met Suhayl. When I asked him about the ḥadīth, he did not know it.”

The correct view is the one the generality holds, because the person from whom the ḥadīth is related from is subject to carelessness and forgetfulness, while the student is reliable and definite [in his ascription], so his transmission should not be rejected because of the possibility [that the teacher may not have taught the ḥadīth]. For that reason, Suhayl used to say after that occurred, “Rabi‘a transmitted to me from me from my father, such and such.” Indeed, many of the greatest scholars related a few ḥadīth which they subsequently forgot and which they later transmitted from the students who had originally heard the ḥadīth from them. One of them used to say, “X transmitted to me from me from Y, such and such.” The expert al-Khaṭīb collected the instances of this in his book *Akhbār man haddatha wa-nasiya (Stories of Those Who Transmitted and Forgot)*. Because a human being is susceptible to forgetfulness, some scholars – including Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) – disliked transmitting from living people.<sup>44</sup> Shāfi‘ī said to Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam,<sup>45</sup> “Beware of relating ḥadīth from living transmitters!” God knows best.

12. Those who take money for transmitting ḥadīth: in the view of some of the authorities in ḥadīth, this makes it impossible to accept a scholar’s transmission. We heard that Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm – that is, Ibn Rāhawayh – was asked about the transmitter who teaches ḥadīth for money and he said, “Hadīth are not to be recorded from him.” Something similar to that is also related from Aḥmad b.

40 Rabi‘a b. Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān Farrūkh al-Taymī was an important early jurist in Medina and Iraq; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:406–7; *EIr*, 1:356.

41 Abū Yazid Suhayl b. Abī Ṣalīḥ al-Madani was a prolific second/eighth-century transmitter, although there seem to have been doubts about the authenticity of his ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:458–62.

42 The father of Suhayl was Abū Ṣalīḥ Dhakwān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sammān al-Zayyāt (d. 101/720), who was an important transmitter of ḥadīth especially famed among his contemporaries for his long beard; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:36–7.

43 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Muḥammad al-Darāwirdī (d. 187/803) was a highly respected Medinese transmitter; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:366–9.

44 Until his teacher was dead, the student ran the risk that he would one day disavow some of his ḥadīth. The teacher’s denial that he taught a ḥadīth which his student ascribed to him naturally reflected negatively on the student.

45 This would appear to be a reference to Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Hakam (182/798–268/882), a student of Shāfi‘ī and prominent Egyptian legal expert; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:474.

Hanbal and Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī.<sup>46</sup> Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn,<sup>47</sup> ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Makki<sup>48</sup> and others were willing to make concessions in regard to taking compensation for teaching ḥadīth; and that is analogous to the situation regarding taking money for teaching the Qur’ān and the like. However, traditionally teaching ḥadīth for money has been seen as a defect of character and it reflects badly on whoever does it, unless it is coupled with an excuse which removes the bad credit. An example is the report which the teacher Abū ‘l-Muzaffar<sup>49</sup> transmitted to me from his father – the expert Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī<sup>50</sup> – in which Abū ‘l-Fadl Muḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Salāmī<sup>51</sup> said that Abū ‘l-Ḥusayn b. al-Naqqūr<sup>52</sup> accepted money for teaching ḥadīth because the teacher Abū Ishaq al-Shirāzī<sup>53</sup> had issued a legal opinion permitting him to do so because the scholars of ḥadīth were keeping him from earning funds to support his dependants. God knows best.

13. The transmission of someone who is known for laxity in hearing or teaching ḥadīth is not to be accepted. Examples are someone who is not bothered about sleeping in the audition sessions or someone who teaches ḥadīth without a sound collated text. Also of this stripe are those who are known for accepting prompting<sup>54</sup> in ḥadīth. Furthermore, the relation of someone who has many anomalous

- 46 Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Idris al-Rāzī (195/811–277/890) was one of the most respected critics of ḥadīth of the third/ninth century. His pronouncements are preserved in the books of his son Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and many later works; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:153.
- 47 Abū Nu‘aym al-Fadl b. Dukayn al-Taymi (130/748–219/834) was an important transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:101.
- 48 Abū ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. al-Marzubān al-Baghawī (ca. 190/805–286/899 or 287) was best known as a student of Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:161; *EIr*, 3:407.
- 49 Abū ‘l-Muzaffar Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahīm b. Abī Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Abī ‘l-Muzaffar Manṣūr (537/1143–618/1221) was often referred to as “Abū ‘l-Muzaffar b. al-Sam‘ānī” to distinguish him from his great-grandfather Abū ‘l-Muzaffar Manṣūr. This well-traveled teacher of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ perished during the Mongol invasion; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 22:107–9.
- 50 Abū Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr Muḥammad b. Manṣūr (506/1113–562/1166) was the author of a number of extremely important works including *al-Ansāb* (ed. ‘Abd Allāh ‘Umar al-Bārūdī, 5 vols, Beirut, 1408/1988), *Ādāb al-imlā wa-‘l-istmlā* (ed. Max Weisweiler, Leiden, 1952) and a continuation of al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s *Ta’rikh Baghdād*; *EI*, 8:1024–5.
- 51 Abū ‘l-Fadl Muḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Salāmī al-Baghdādī (467/1074–550/1155) started out as a Shāfi‘īte and Ash‘arīte, but later became a Hanbalite. One of the most popular transmitters of his day, he taught ḥadīth for free but charged a fee for poetry; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:265–71.
- 52 Abū ‘l-Ḥusayn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Naqqūr (381/991–470/1078) was alone in transmitting several desirable ḥadīth works and therefore was in the position to charge his students for the service; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 18:372–4.
- 53 Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī b. Yūsuf al-Shirāzī (393/1003–476/1083) came to Baghdad in 415/1024 from his hometown of Firuzābād and became one of the most renowned Shāfi‘īte jurists in the city; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 18:452–64.
- 54 *Talqīn* here refers to the practice ascribed to unscrupulous and usually unnamed students of tricking a teacher who could no longer remember which ḥadīth he once taught – most often because old age had destroyed his memory or because he could no longer consult his notes, since he had either lost them or gone blind – into acknowledging certain ḥadīth as his own, although in actuality he had never heard them before.

and unfamiliar ḥadīth may not be accepted. It is reported that Shu‘ba said, “Anomalous ḥadīth come only from anomalous men.” The relation of someone who is known for extreme negligence in his transmissions may not be accepted when he does not transmit from a sound text. All of this undermines one’s faith in a transmitter and his accuracy.

It is reported that Ibn al-Mubārak, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, [Abū Bakr] al-Ḥumaydī and others maintained that the transmissions of someone who makes a mistake in a ḥadīth become void and he becomes unfit to have his ḥadīth recorded, if when the mistake is explained to him, he does not recant but instead continues to insist on relating that ḥadīth. There is some doubt about this. The practice is not reprehensible, if it appears that it is merely a case of stubbornness on his part or something similar. God knows best.

14. In these recent times, people have turned away from taking into consideration the totality of the standards for the transmitters and teachers of ḥadīth which we have elucidated. They have not been bound by them in their transmissions, on account of the inability to fulfil them at the level which their predecessors attained in the past. The reason for that is, as we explained in the beginning of this book of ours (see above p. 4), that the aim in using isnāds ultimately goes back to the preservation of the special quality of this Community and vigilance against the interruption of the continuity of the isnāds. So, in regard to the aforementioned standards, let us take into consideration only those appropriate for attaining this aim in its barest form and let it suffice to qualify a teacher that he be a Muslim, adult, of sound mind and not manifestly wrong-doing or stupid. In regard to his accuracy (*qabṭ*), let it suffice that one find the documentation that he heard the text (*samā‘ihi*) recorded in the handwriting of an unimpeachable individual and that he relate from a text conforming to the text of his teacher.

The ḥadīth expert and jurist Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī (God – He is exalted – bless him) said something like this earlier. He said, according to what we heard, that there has been an increase in the type of student who extensively attends the ḥadīth classes of some of the transmitters of his time who do not memorize their ḥadīth, recite them properly from their books or recognize what is recited to them when the original of their own audition is recited to them. He justified this on the basis that the ḥadīth which have been established as sound or which fall between soundness and sickness have been recorded and written down in the comprehensive collections which the authorities in ḥadīth put together. It is not conceivable that any of these ḥadīth escaped the attention of all of these authorities – even if it is possible that some of these ḥadīth escaped the attention of some of the authorities – because of the guarantee of the legislator (*sāhib al-shari‘a*) [that is, the Prophet] that they will be preserved. Bayhaqī said, “So today when someone brings a ḥadīth unknown to all of these authorities, it may not be accepted from him. When someone brings a ḥadīth known to them, then he is not alone in transmitting what he relates and the proof value of his ḥadīth is in actuality based on it being related by the others.” The point of his relating

the ḥadīth and his hearing it is the continuous transmission of the ḥadīth with ‘He transmitted to us’ and ‘He informed us’ and the continuance of this blessing which God specially granted this community as a token of honor to our chosen Prophet (Peace be upon him and his family).” God knows best.

15. Concerning the explanation of the terms the practitioners of this discipline employ in personality criticism: Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī<sup>55</sup> ranked them in his book on personality criticism. He did this well and made a good job of it. We will rank them in the same way, giving what he said and adding to it the relevant material we read in other sources, God – He is exalted – willing. The terminology of accreditation has several levels.

- (a). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said of someone that he is ‘reliable’ (*thiqā*) or ‘exact’ (*mutqin*), his ḥadīth may be cited as proofs.” The same is true if he is called “trustworthy” (*thabat*) or a “proof” (*hujja*) and it is also the case if it is said about an upright transmitter (*‘adl*) that he is “retentive” (*hāfiẓ*) or “accurate” (*dābit*). God knows best.
- (b). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, “If it is said that a transmitter is ‘veracious’ (*sadūq*), ‘his station is veracity’ (*mahalluhū al-sidq*) or ‘there is nothing wrong with him’ (*lā baṣa bihi*), he is someone whose ḥadīth may be written down and examined. This is the second rank.” What he said is correct because these expressions do not imply the stipulation of accuracy. The ḥadīth of this kind of transmitter are examined and investigated to determine the level of his accuracy. The way to do this was explained in the beginning of this Category.<sup>56</sup> If we cannot make an exhaustive examination [of all of his ḥadīth] to determine whether he is essentially absolutely accurate yet we desire to adduce one of his ḥadīth as a proof, we must – in the fashion described in Category 15 – analyze that very ḥadīth and see whether it has an original version (*asf*) in the transmission of someone else.

It is well known that ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Maḥdī, the model in this matter, transmitted a ḥadīth and said, “Abū Khaldūn<sup>57</sup> transmitted to us.” He was asked, “Was he reliable?” He said, “He was veracious, honest and charitable” – or, in one version: “excellent.” The reliable transmitters are Shu‘ba and Sufyān.” That is contrary to what came down from Ibn Abī Khaythama.<sup>58</sup> He said, “I said to Yāḥyā b. Ma‘īn,

55 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī (240/854–327/938) wrote a number of important works on ḥadīth and is best known for preserving the critical judgements of his father Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and his other mentor Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:178–9. The following discussion is adapted from *Jarh*, 1(1):37.

56 See the second section.

57 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):147; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(2):327–8.

58 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Zuhayr b. Ḥarb l-Nasa‘ī (185/801–279/892), known as Ibn Abī Khaythama, was an important scholar with a special interest in ḥadīth. Only a small portion of his famous *Ta’rīkh* seems to have survived; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:319–20.

'You say, "There is nothing wrong with X" and "Y is weak." ' He said, 'When I say to you, "There is nothing wrong with him," then he is reliable. When I say to you, "He is weak," then he is not reliable and his ḥadīth are not recorded.' " This interpretation of "There is nothing wrong with him" is not related from any other scholar of ḥadīth. Indeed, Yahyā b. Maṣīn ascribed it only to himself and it is contrary to what Ibn Abī Ḥātim said. God knows best.

- (c). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "If it is said regarding a transmitter, 'teacher' (*shaykh*), he is in the third rank. His ḥadīth may be recorded and examined; however, he is inferior to the second."
- (d). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "If it is said regarding a transmitter, 'good in ḥadīth' (*ṣāliḥ al-ḥadīth*), his ḥadīth may be recorded for analysis (*li-'l-i‘tibār*). " It is reported that Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad b. Sīnān<sup>59</sup> said, "Sometimes the ḥadīth of a man who had some weakness but was veracious was brought up and 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Mahdī used to say, 'A man good in ḥadīth.' " God knows best.

Their terms of discreditation are also on several levels.

- (a). Their saying "soft in ḥadīth" (*layyin al-ḥadīth*): Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "When they reply regarding a man, 'soft in ḥadīth,' he is one of those whose ḥadīth may be recorded and examined for the sake of analysis." Ḥamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmi<sup>60</sup> asked the authority Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqutnī, "When you say 'X is soft,' what do you mean by it?" He said, "He is not 'fallen' (*sāqīf*) and 'abandoned' (*matrūk*) in ḥadīth, but he is discredited (*majrūk*) by something which does not cause him to fall out of the state of integrity."
- (b). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "When they say, 'He is not strong' (*laysa bi-qawī*), that person is in the same position as the first in regard to the recording of his ḥadīth; however, he is inferior."
- (c). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "When they say, 'weak in ḥadīth' (*da‘if al-ḥadīth*), that person is inferior to the second. His ḥadīth are not thrown out; rather they are analyzed."
- (d). Ibn Abī Ḥātim said, "When they say, 'abandoned in ḥadīth,' 'wasted in ḥadīth' (*dhāhib al-ḥadīth*) or 'liar' (*kadhdhāb*); the man is 'fallen' in ḥadīth. His ḥadīth are not recorded. It is the fourth rank."

Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, "The highest expressions for the states of transmitters are a 'proof' or 'reliable.' The lowest are 'liar' or 'fallen.'"<sup>61</sup>

<sup>59</sup> The ḥadīth of Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad b. Sīnān al-Wāṣīṭ al-Qaṭṭān (d. 256/870) were cited by a number of scholars of the next generation; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:244–6.

<sup>60</sup> Abu 'l-Qasim Ḥamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmi (340/951–428/1036) was a student of Dāraqutnī from Jurjān who preserved many of his technical comments in the work *Su‘alat Ḥamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmi li-'l-Dāraqutnī wa-ghayrihi min al-mashayikh* (ed. Muwaffaq b. 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Qādir, Riyadī, 1404/1984); Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:469–71.

<sup>61</sup> *Kifaya*, 22.

Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘īm al-Šāqīdī al-Furāwī<sup>62</sup> informed us through recitation to him in Nishapur: Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Fārisī<sup>63</sup> informed us: the expert Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī informed us: Abu ‘l-Ḥusayn b. al-Fadl<sup>64</sup> informed us: ‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far<sup>65</sup> informed us: Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān<sup>66</sup> told us, he said: I heard Aḥmad b. Ṣalīḥ<sup>67</sup> say, “A transmitter’s ḥadīth are not rejected until everyone agrees that they are to be rejected. It may be said, ‘X is weak.’ However, it may not be said, ‘X is abandoned,’ unless everyone agrees on rejecting his ḥadīth.”

Some terms employed in this matter which Ibn Abī Ḥātim and others have not explained are “X, people have related from him,” “X is middling” (*wasaṭ*), “X is mediocre in ḥadīth” (*muqārib al-ḥadīth*), “X is disturbed in regard to ḥadīth” (*muḍṭarib al-ḥadīth*), “X is not cited as an authority” (*la yuḥtajju bihi*), “X is unknown” (*majhūl*), “X is nothing” (*lā shay’*), “X is not approved” (*laysa bi-dhāk*). Sometimes it is said, “He is not so strong” (*laysa bi-dhāka ’l-qawī*), “There is a weakness in X” or “in the ḥadīth of X,” – and this expression is less serious in discreditation than saying, “X is weak in ḥadīth,” – and “X, I do not know anything wrong about him.” In accrediting, this last expression is inferior to saying, “There is nothing wrong with him.” All of these phrases and the others like them have analogues which we have explained or which follow a principle that we have established. We will – God (He is exalted) willing – point them out. God knows best.

62 Furāwī (ca. 522/1128–608/1212) was a teacher of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ who transmitted a number of important books. He had three *kuṇyas*, all of which Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ uses in the course of this work; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 21:494–6.

63 Abu ‘l-Ma‘ālī Muḥammad b. Ismā‘īl al-Fārisī (448/1056–539/1144) was a prominent student of Bayhaqī; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 20:93.

64 Abu ‘l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Qatṭān (335/947–415/1024) was primarily known for having transmitted Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān’s *Ta’rīkh* from ‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:331–2.

65 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Ja‘far b. Durustawayh al-Fārisī (258/872–347/958) was an early grammarian who worked extensively in hadīth; *EP*, 3:758; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:106–8, 9:96–8.

66 Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawi (d. 277/890) wrote *Kitāb al-Ma‘rifā wa-’l-ta’rīkh* (ed. Akram Diyā’ al-‘Umari, 2nd edn, 3 vols, Beirut, 1401/1981), a historical work with a special emphasis on matters of interest to scholars of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:319.

67 Abu Jafar Aḥmad b. Ṣalīḥ al-Miṣri (170/787–248/862) was a controversial transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:160–77.

## Category 24

### THE METHODS OF HEARING AND RECEIVING ḤADĪTH, AND THE MANNER OF REGISTERING THESE

(*Ma‘rifat kayfiyat samā‘ al-ḥadīth wa-tahammulihi  
wa-ṣifat ḏabīhi*)

---

Be aware that the ways to convey and receive ḥadīth take various forms. Let us preface our exposition of them with the discussion of a few issues.

1. An individual may validly receive ḥadīth before he possesses the qualifications [necessary to transmit them]. The transmission of someone who received his ḥadīth before his conversion to Islam and transmitted them afterwards may be accepted. The same is true of the relation of someone who heard ḥadīth before attaining adulthood and related them afterwards. Some people forbade that and they were wrong to do so, because people accepted the transmission of the young Companions – like al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali,<sup>1</sup> Ibn ‘Abbās, [‘Urwa] b. al-Zubayr, al-Nu‘mān b. Bashīr<sup>2</sup> and their fellows – without making any distinction between the ḥadīth they received before reaching adulthood and those they received after. Furthermore, from early times until now people have continued to bring young boys to classes devoted to the transmission and audition of ḥadīth and they credit their transmission of the ḥadīth they heard at that age. God knows best.
2. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī<sup>3</sup> said, “It is recommended that the student begin to *write* ḥadīth at the age of twenty, because that is when the intellect is formed. I like the student younger than that to occupy himself with learning the Qur’ān and his religious duties.” It is reported that Sufyān al-Thawrī said, “A man who wants to study ḥadīth should first serve God twenty years.” Mūsā b. Ishāq<sup>4</sup> was asked, “How is it that you did not write ḥadīth from Abū Nu‘aym [al-Fadl b. Dukayn]?” He said, “The Kūfans did not send their young sons to study ḥadīth until they completed their twentieth year.” Mūsā b. Hārūn<sup>5</sup> said, “The Baṣrans

---

1 Al-Ḥasan b. ‘Ali (3/625–49/669) was the beloved grandson of the Prophet. His father was the third caliph ‘Ali and the Prophet’s daughter Fāṭimā. He posed a threat to the Umayyad caliph Mu‘āwiya until he was persuaded to renounce his claims. He died in Medina; *EF* 3:240–43.

2 Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū Muḥammad) al-Nu‘mān b. Bashīr b. Sa‘d al-Khaṣraju was born around the time of the Prophet’s emigration to Medina and served as a governor under the Umayyads. He died late in 64/684; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:411–12.

3 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayr b. Aḥmad b. Sulaymān al-Zubayrī (d. 317/929) was a blind Shāfi‘ite who wrote a number of works on legal topics; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:495.

4 Abū Bakr Mūsā b. Ishāq (ca. 200/815–297/909) was a Shāfi‘ite scholar who served as a judge in Nishapur and al-Ahwāz; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:579–81.

5 Abū ʿImrān Mūsā b. Hārūn al-Ḥammāl (214/829–294/907) was considered one of the greatest experts in ḥadīth of his era; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:116–19.

write ḥadīth at ten years of age, the Kūfans at twenty and the Syrians at thirty.” (God knows best.)

When the preservation of the continuity of the isnād is taken into account, [it becomes clear that] one should take a child to *hear* ḥadīth as soon as his audition becomes valid. Children may [later] occupy themselves with writing, acquiring, registering and recording ḥadīth when they become qualified and ready for that. This varies from person to person and it is not confined to any particular age, as a number of people before us have stated. God knows best.

3. There is some disagreement over the earliest time valid for a child’s audition of ḥadīth. We have heard that Mūsā b. Ḥārūn al-Ḥammāl – one of the great experts and critics of ḥadīth – was asked, “When should a boy hear ḥadīth?” He said, “When he becomes able to distinguish between a cow and a riding animal” – or according to another relation, “between a cow and a donkey.” We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) was asked, “When does it become permissible for a boy to hear ḥadīth?” He said, “When he can understand and comprehend.” He was told that someone had said, “The audition of a boy is not permitted until he reaches fifteen.” He rejected that statement and said, “What a bad thing to say!” The teacher Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Asādī<sup>6</sup> informed me from Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Ashīrī<sup>7</sup> that the expert al-Qāḍī Iyād b. Mūsā al-Sabtī al-Yahṣībī<sup>8</sup> said, “For the audition of ḥadīth, the experts have set as the youngest age that of Maḥmūd b. al-Rabi‘,<sup>9</sup> and he quoted with Buḥkārī’s isnād the relation Buḥkārī included in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* under the heading “When Does the Audition of a Child Become Valid?”<sup>10</sup> from Maḥmūd b. al-Rabi‘: “I was cognizant of a jet of water the Prophet (Peace be upon him) spurted in my face from a bucket when I was five years old.”<sup>11</sup> In another relation, his age is given as four. The threshold of five is the one on which the practice of the modern scholars of ḥadīth has settled. They write for a boy five and over, “He heard” (*samī‘a*) and for someone who has not yet reached five, “He attended” (*haḍara*) or “He was brought” (*uḥdira*). In this

6 Ibn al-Uṣṭādh (534/1139–623/1226) was an Aleppan Shāfi‘ī who heard ḥadīth from many of the prominent transmitters of the day; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 22:303–4.

7 Ashīrī (d. 561/1166) was a Mālikī expert in ḥadīth from North Africa; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:466–7.

8 Al-Qāḍī Iyād (476/1083–544/1149) was one of the most prominent scholars of his era in ḥadīth and law. His book *al-Ilmā‘* was one of the principal sources Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ consulted in the composition of the *Muqaddima*; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:455–6, *Suppl.*, 1:630–2; *EF*, 4:289–90.

9 The Companion Abū Muḥammad (or “Abū Nu‘aym”) Maḥmūd b. al-Rabi‘ al-Khaṣrajī (d. ca. 99/718) seems to have been best known for his role in the incident described here; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:519–20.

10 *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 1:31. K. al-Ilm, B. Maṭā yaṣīḥū samā‘ al-ṣaghīr.

11 *Ilmā‘*, 62–3

matter we *should* consider the case of each child individually. If we find that the child is more advanced than the state of one who lacks the mental development to understand what is said to him or to give an answer to what is asked of him, and the like, we regard his audition as valid, even if he is younger than five. If this is not the case, we do not regard his audition as valid, even if he is five, or, indeed, fifty.

In fact, we read that Ibrāhim b. Sa'īd al-Jawhari<sup>12</sup> said, “I saw a boy of four years – and he had been brought to the caliph al-Ma'mūn<sup>13</sup> – who recited the Qur'ān and looked into the question of the plausibility of human reasoning. Yet, when he became hungry, he still cried.” We heard that the judge Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-İsbahānī<sup>14</sup> said, “I learned the Qur'ān when I was five years old. I was brought to Abū Bakr b. al-Muqrī<sup>15</sup> to hear ḥadīth from him when I was four [sic] and one of those in attendance said, ‘Do not credit him with the audition (*lā tusammi'u lahū*) of what is recited, for he is too young.’ Ibn al-Muqrī said to me, ‘Recite *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn*,’ and I recited it. Then he said, ‘Recite *Sūrat al-Takwīr*,’ and I recited it. Then someone else said to me, ‘Recite *Sūrat al-Mursalāt*,’ and I recited it without an error. Ibn al-Muqrī said, ‘Grant him audition. The responsibility is mine.’”

The ḥadīth of Maḥmūd b. al-Rabī' indicates the validity of the audition of a five-year-old *like* Maḥmūd and does not indicate the lack of validity for someone younger than five or the validity of it for someone five years old who has not attained the discernment of Maḥmūd (God be pleased with him). God knows best.

### An Exposition of the Types of the Means of Conveying and Receiving Ḥadīth

There are eight types in total.

I “Audition of the speech of the teacher” (*al-samā' min lafz al-shaykh*): this may be subcategorized into dictation (*imlā'*) of the ḥadīth and transmitting the ḥadīth without dictation. It makes no difference whether the teacher recites from memory or from his book. This means of transmission is the most elevated in the eyes of the masses.

<sup>12</sup> Abū Ishaq Ibrāhim b. Sa'īd al-Jawhari al-Baghdādī (d. ca. 250/864) is best known for the *musnād* ascribed to him; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:149–51.

<sup>13</sup> Al-Ma'mūn was the son of Hārūn al-Rashīd and the seventh 'Abbāsid caliph. He ruled from 198/813 until 201/817; *EP*, 6:331–9.

<sup>14</sup> This seems to be a reference to Ibn al-Labbān, a respected scholar who died in Isfahan in 446/1054; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:653–4.

<sup>15</sup> Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ibrāhim b. 'Alī b. 'Aṣim b. Zādhan b. al-Muqrī (285/898–381/991) was a scholar of ḥadīth who, it is surprising to note, served as the librarian of al-Ṣāhib b. 'Abbād; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:398–402.

One of the things we hear from al-Qādī Iyād b. Mūsā al-Sabtī – a well-informed modern scholar – is the statement: “There is no dispute that in reference to this form of taking up ḥadīth it is permissible for the student who heard the teacher to say, ‘He transmitted to us’ (*haddathanā*), ‘He informed us’ (*akhbaranā*), ‘He told us’ (*anba'anā*), ‘I heard X saying’ (*sami'tu fulānan yaqūlū*), ‘X said to us’ (*qāla lanā fulān*) and ‘X mentioned to us’ (*dhakara lanā fulān*).”<sup>16</sup> There is in fact some doubt about this. Because some of these terms have come to be widely used for specifically indicating material not heard from the speech of the teacher – as we will show, God (He is exalted) willing – they should not be applied without qualification to material heard from the speech of the teacher, since they can cause misunderstanding and confusion. (God knows best.) The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “For this form of reception, the highest of these expressions is ‘I heard,’ followed by ‘He transmitted to us’ and ‘He transmitted to me.’ One rarely says ‘I heard’ for a ḥadīth received through licensing or correspondence (*ahādīth al-ijāza wa-'l-mukātaba*), or for the misrepresentation (*tadlis*) of ḥadīth one did not actually hear.”<sup>17</sup>

Actually, some of the scholars of ḥadīth did use to say, “He transmitted to us,” for material licensed to them. It is related that al-Ḥasan<sup>18</sup> used to say, “Abū Hurayra transmitted to us.” This is interpreted to mean that Abū Hurayra transmitted to the people of Medina and al-Ḥasan was there at that time. However, he did not personally hear anything from Abū Hurayra. On the other hand, some scholars have asserted that al-Ḥasan did hear ḥadīth from him. God knows best.<sup>19</sup>

The phrase “He informed us” (*akhbaranā*) comes next. It is used extensively, to the point that a number of scholars – including Ḥammād b. Salama, 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak, Hushaym b. Bashir, 'Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā, 'Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām, Yazīd b. Hārūn,<sup>20</sup> 'Amr b. 'Awn,<sup>21</sup> Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Tamīmī,<sup>22</sup>

16 *Ilmā'*, 69.

17 *Kifāya*, 284.

18 Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥasan b. Abi 'l-Ḥasan Yaṣar al-Baṣrī (21/642–110/728) was a renowned preacher and one of the most significant early transmitters of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *EP*, 3:247–8; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:591–4.

19 Like most of this discussion, this passage seems to have been taken from al-Khaṭīb's *Kifāya* (p. 284) but there it concludes, “This is interpreted to mean that Abū Hurayra transmitted to the people of al-Baṣra and al-Ḥasan was one of them, although he was in Medina at that time. So al-Ḥasan did not hear anything from him and did not use the phrase ‘I heard’ for any of that.”

20 Abū Khālid Yazīd b. Hārūn (118/736–206/821) was a Qur'aṇ commentator from Wāsit; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:40.

21 Abū ʿUthmān 'Amr b. 'Awn b. Aws al-Sulāmī (d. 225/840) was a well-respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:450–1.

22 Abū Zakariyā Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā b. Bukayr al-Tamīmī al-Nisābūrī (142/759–226/840) was a prominent expert in ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:512–19.

Ishāq b. Rāhawayh, Abū Mas'ud Aḥmad b. al-Furāt al-Rāzī,<sup>23</sup> Muḥammad b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī<sup>24</sup> and others – almost never reported the ḥadīth they heard from the speech of someone who transmitted to them with anything but the phrase “He informed us.” Al-Khaṭīb stated<sup>25</sup> that Muḥammad b. Rāfi‘<sup>26</sup> said, “Abd al-Razzāq used to say, ‘He informed us,’ until Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Ishāq b. Rāhawayh came and said to him, ‘Say, ‘He transmitted to us.’’” So for everything I [viz. Muḥammad b. Rāfi‘] heard with them, he said, ‘He transmitted to us,’ while for his earlier transmissions he said, ‘He informed us.’” Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī also stated<sup>27</sup> that the expert Muḥammad b. Abi 'l-Fawāris<sup>28</sup> said, “Hushaym, Yazid b. Hārūn and 'Abd al-Razzāq say only, ‘He informed us.’ When you find ‘He transmitted to us,’ it is an error of the copyist.” (God knows best.) All of this was before it became common to restrict “He informed us” to material recited to the teacher.

The terms “He told us” (*anba'a nā*) and “He communicated to us” (*nabba'a nā*) – both of which are rarely used [for material heard from the speech of the teacher<sup>29</sup>] – come after “He informed us.”

“He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” are more elevated than “I heard” in another respect. This is that “I heard” contains no indication that the teacher related the ḥadīth *to the student* or addressed it *to him*. “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” do contain an indication that the teacher addressed the ḥadīth to the student and related it to him, or that he was among those to whom this was done. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb asked his teacher, the jurist and ḥadīth expert Abū Bakr al-Barqānī (God – He is exalted – bless him), about the secret reason for his saying, “I heard,” – rather than “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” – for the ḥadīth he related to them from Abu 'l-Qāsim 'Abd Allah b. Ibrāhīm al-Jurjānī al-Ābandūnī.<sup>30</sup> Barqānī told him that Abu 'l-Qāsim, for all his reliability and righteousness, was restrictive in regard to relating ḥadīth. Barqānī used to sit where Abu 'l-Qāsim could not see him or detect his presence so that he could hear from him the ḥadīth he was transmitting to the person inside with him. For that reason,

<sup>23</sup> Abū Mas'ud Aḥmad b. al-Furāt al-Rāzī (ca. 180/796–258/872) was a well-traveled scholar of ḥadīth who settled in Isfahan; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:480–88.

<sup>24</sup> Ibn al-Durays (200/816–294/906) was a scholar of ḥadīth who wrote the book *Faqā'il al-Qur'ān*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:42.

<sup>25</sup> *Kifāya*, 286.

<sup>26</sup> Abū 'Abd Allah Muḥammad b. Rāfi‘ al-Qurayṣī (ca. 170/786–245/860) was an important scholar of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:214–18.

<sup>27</sup> *Kifāya*, 286.

<sup>28</sup> Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Fāris al-Baghdādī (338/949–412/1022), known as Ibn Abi 'l-Fawāris, was a prominent critic of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:223–4.

<sup>29</sup> See Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughīth*, 2:20.

<sup>30</sup> Ābandūnī (274/887–368/978) was a prominent transmitter in his day; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:261–3.

Barqānī says, “I heard,” and not “He transmitted to us” or “He informed us,” because Abu ’l-Qāsim’s intention was to transmit only to the person inside with him.

“X said to us” (*qāla lanā fulān*) or “X mentioned to us” (*dhakara lanā fulān*) are like “X transmitted to us.” However, they are appropriate for the ḥadīth the transmitter heard from someone in a study session (*mudhākara*) and are more suitable for this than “He transmitted to us.” In the discussion of “suspension” (*ta’liq*) at the end of Category 11 (see above, p. 45 ff.), we recounted that many of the scholars of ḥadīth use these expressions to designate the ḥadīth which passed between them in study sessions and competitions (*munāzarāt*). The most self-effacing of the expressions for this is “X said” or “X mentioned,” without saying “to me” or “to us,” and the like. As we said above, in the section on the *isnād* with “from,”<sup>31</sup> scholars interpreted these and similar expressions as indicating audition, when it is known in general that the student met the teacher and heard ḥadīth from him, especially when it is known of the student that he used “X said” only for the ḥadīth he actually heard from the teacher.

Hajjāj b. Muḥammad al-A‘wār<sup>32</sup> used to relate Ibn Jurayj’s books from him, saying for them, “Ibn Jurayj said.” People took these books from him and cited his relations as proofs. He was known to have related only what he had heard.

The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb restricted interpreting the phrase “X said” as indicative of audition solely to those whose custom was known to be similar to this.<sup>33</sup> The well-documented and well-known view is the one we gave above. God knows best.

II “Recitation to the teacher” (*al-qirā'a 'ala 'l-shaykh*) is the second means of taking and receiving ḥadīth. Most of the transmitters of ḥadīth call it “presentation” (*ard*) since the reciter “presents” the ḥadīth he recites to the teacher, just as the reciter “presents” the Qur'ān to the Qur'ān instructor. It makes no difference whether you are the reciter or someone else recites while you listen. You may recite from a book or from your memory. The teacher may have memorized the material recited to him or not. In the latter case he or some other reliable individual should hold his text. There is no disagreement that this is a valid form of transmission; that is, with the exception of the views recounted from some of those whose disagreement is not taken into account. God knows best.

There is a disagreement as to whether “recitation to the teacher” is equivalent to “audition of the speech of the teacher” in terms of rank or whether it is inferior

31 See above, p. 46.

32 Some considered Abū Muḥammad Hajjāj al-A‘wār (d. 206/821) to be the best student of Ibn Jurayj; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:447–50.

33 *Kifāya*, 289.

or superior. Abū Ḥanīfā, Ibn Abī Dhī'b<sup>34</sup> and others are said to have preferred “recitation to the teacher” to “audition of his speech,” and that is related from Mālik as well. Mālik and others are also said to have regarded them as equal. It is said that equating them is the doctrine of most of the scholars of the Hejaz and al-Kūfa, the doctrine of Mālik, his followers and his Medinese teachers and the doctrine of Bukhārī and others. The correct view is to give preference to “audition of the speech of the teacher” and to rate “recitation to him” on a second rank. It is said that this is the doctrine of the majority of scholars in the eastern lands. God knows best.

The ways of expressing “recitation to the teacher” when transmitting on the basis of it are on several levels. The best and safest is “I recited to X” – or “It was recited to X while I was listening” – “and he acknowledged it” (*qara’tu ‘alā fulān aw qur’ā ‘alā fulān wa-anā asma‘u fa-aqarra bihi*). This is unquestionably valid. The expressions validly applied in unqualified form to “audition of the speech of the teacher” come next, provided that, when they are used in this case, they are qualified by the student saying, “X transmitted to us *by means of recitation to him*” (*haddathānā fulān qirā’atan ‘alayhi*), “He informed us *by means of recitation to him*” (*akhbaranā qirā’atan ‘alayhi*) or something similar. In the same way, “He declaimed to us *by means of recitation to him*” (*anshadanā qirā’atan ‘alayhi*) may be used for verse.

There are several different views about the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” to an instance of “recitation to the teacher.” Some scholars of ḥadīth forbid both of them: It is said that this was the doctrine of Ibn al-Mubārak, Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Tamīmī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Nasā’ī and others.

Some hold the opinion that it is licit. They maintain that “recitation to the teacher” is like “audition of the speech of the teacher” in regard to the permissibility of the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us,” “He informed us” and “He told us.” It is said that this was the doctrine of most of the Hejazi and Kūfan; the view of Zuhri, Mālik, Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna, Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qatṭān<sup>35</sup> as well as other ancient authorities; and it was the doctrine of Bukhārī – the author of the *Sahīh* – as well as a number of other transmitters. Some of these also permitted the student to say, “I heard X,” for “recitation to the teacher.”

A third doctrine differentiates between the two phrases in this regard, forbidding the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and permitting the unqualified application of “He informed us.” This is the doctrine of Shāfi‘ī and his followers. It is also transmitted from Muslim – the author of the *Sahīh* – and many of the scholars of the east. The author of *Kitāb al-Inṣāf* (*The Book of*

<sup>34</sup> Abu ‘l-Hārith Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Mughira al-Qurashī (80/699–159/776) was an early scholar famed for his asceticism and piety; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:139–49.

<sup>35</sup> Abū Sa‘īd Yaḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qatṭān al-Tamīmī (120/738–198/813) was one of the greatest critics of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:175–88.

*the Fair View*), Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tamīmī al-Jawhārī al-Miṣrī,<sup>36</sup> said, “This is the doctrine of the countless majority of the scholars of ḥadīth. They made ‘He informed us’ a symbol occupying the place of the statement, ‘I recited it to him: he did not utter it to me.’ Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasā’ī, among a number of other authorities like him who transmitted ḥadīth to us, was one of those in our time who used to advocate this view.”

It is said that the first to make a distinction between these two terms was Ibn Wahb<sup>37</sup> in Egypt. This is refuted by the fact that this is also said of Ibn Jurayj and Awzā’ī [who were earlier] – Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related it about them – unless what is meant is that Ibn Wahb was the first to do this *in Egypt*. God knows best.

Differentiating between “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” has become widespread, predominating among the scholars of ḥadīth. The attempt to justify the differentiation from the standpoint of linguistic usage is labored and contrived. The best that may be said for it is that it is a convention among the scholars of ḥadīth who sought by observing it to discriminate between the two means of receiving ḥadīth. The first is specified by the term “He transmitted to us” because of its strong implication of pronunciation and oral communication.

One of the best things that is related about someone who subscribed to this doctrine is what the expert Abū Bakr al-Barqānī related<sup>38</sup> to the effect that Abū Ḥātim Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb al-Harawī<sup>39</sup> – one of the chief scholars of ḥadīth in Khurāsān – was reciting the *Saḥīh* of Bukhārī to a teacher from Farabrī<sup>40</sup> and for each ḥadīth he said to his teacher, “Farabrī transmitted to you.” When he completed the book, he heard his teacher say that he had heard the book from Farabrī by means of recitation to him. So Abū Ḥātim repeated the recitation of the entire book and he said to his teacher for all of it, “Farabrī informed you.” God knows best.

### *Subsidiary Issues*

(a). When during the recitation to the teacher his text is in the hands of someone else and this person may be relied upon, is attentive to what is recited and is qualified for this: if the teacher knows the material recited to him, it is as if his text were in his own hand, only better because of the cooperation of the mind of two people on it. If the teacher does not know the material recited to him, there

36 I have not succeeded in identifying this individual.

37 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allah b. Wahb al-Miṣrī (125/743–197/812) was a prominent early Egyptian scholar *EI* 3:963; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:466.

38 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kifāya*, 303–4.

39 I have not been able to identify this individual.

40 The long-lived Abū ‘Abd Allah Muḥammad b. Yūsuf al-Farabrī (231/845–320/932) was the most prominent transmitter of Bukhārī’s *Saḥīh* of his generation; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:10–13.

is some disagreement about [the validity of the transmission, when he is not holding his text]. One of the authorities in legal theory held that this form of audition is not valid. The preferred opinion is that it is valid and most of the teachers and scholars of ḥadīth act upon it. When the teacher's text is in the hands of the reciter and he is someone who may be relied upon in regard to his religion and knowledge, the verdict on it is the same; and it is in fact more deserving of being considered valid. When the teacher does not know the material recited to him and his text is in the hands of someone who may not be relied upon to hold it and whose neglect of what is recited may not be guaranteed against, it is the same whether he is the reciter or no, for it is not an audition which may be credited. God knows best.

(b). When the reciter says to the teacher, "X informed you," or "You said, 'X informed you,'" or something similar to that while the teacher remains silent, listening attentively to it, comprehending it and not objecting to it; then this behavior is sufficient to [establish the accuracy of the recitation]. Some of the Zāhirites and others have imposed the condition that the teacher must verbally assent to it. The Shāfi'iite jurists Abū Ishaq al-Shirāzī, Abū 'l-Fath Sulaym al-Rāzī and Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāgh<sup>41</sup> stated this unequivocally. Abū Naṣr said, "The student may not say, 'He transmitted to me' or 'He informed me,' [without his teacher's verbal assent]. He may act in accordance with what was recited to him, and, if he wants to relate it from his teacher, he should say, 'I recited to him' – or 'It was recited to him' – 'while he was listening' (*gara'tu 'alayhi aw qur'a 'alayhi wa-huwa yasma'u*)."<sup>42</sup> In contrast, it is related from some writers that one of the Zāhirites stipulated that the teacher must express his assent upon the completion of the audition through the reciter asking him, "Is it as I recited to you?" and his saying yes. The correct view is that this is not necessary. The obvious implications suffice and the silence of the teacher in the aforementioned fashion takes the place of his explicit endorsement of the reciter. This is the doctrine of the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth, jurists and others. God knows best.

(c). According to what we hear, the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim (God bless him) said, "In transmission, the procedure I prefer and the one I saw most of my teachers and the authorities of my era adhering to is for the student to say for the material he took verbally from the speech of the transmitter while he was alone, 'X transmitted to me,' and for the material he took from his speech in the presence of others, 'X transmitted to us.' For the material he personally recited to the transmitter, he should say, 'X informed me,' and for what was recited while he was merely present, 'X informed us.'"<sup>42</sup> We indeed heard something

<sup>41</sup> Abū Naṣr 'Abd al-Sayyid b. Muhammād b. 'Abd al-Wahid (400/1009–477/1084), known as Ibn al-Ṣabbāgh, was, with Abū Ishaq al-Shirāzī, one of the most prominent Shāfi'iite scholars in fifth-/eleventh-century Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:464–5.

<sup>42</sup> *'Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 260.

similar to that from 'Abd Allāh b. Wahb, the disciple of Mālik (God be pleased with them).<sup>43</sup> It is extremely good.

If a transmitter has doubts regarding something in his possession as to whether it falls under the heading of "He transmitted to us" or "He informed us" or under the heading of "He transmitted to me" or "He informed me," because of his uncertainty over whether he was alone or with others at the time of the reception and the audition; it is possible for us to say: Let him say, "He transmitted to me," or "He informed me," because the absence of others is presumed.

However, the authority 'Ali b. 'Abd Allāh al-Madīnī stated from his teacher, the authority Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Qatṭān, that the transmitter should say, "X transmitted to us," for the material regarding which he is uncertain whether *his teacher* said, "X transmitted to me" or, "X transmitted to us." This would require that the transmitter himself say, "He transmitted to us," when he is in doubt over his own audition in such a case. In my opinion, this is possible because "He transmitted to me" is more complete in terms of rank and "He transmitted to us" is more defective. So, when the transmitter is in doubt, let him limit himself to the defective form, because the absence of the additional person[s] is presumed. This is a fine point. I found that the expert Aḥmad al-Bayhāqī (God bless him) had chosen the view I presented above [that is, the preference for "me"], after quoting the statement of [Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd] al-Qatṭān.

Making this distinction [between "me" and "us"] on the principle of [Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim] is desirable but not mandatory. Al-Khaṭīb related this view from all of the scholars of ḥadīth.<sup>44</sup> Thus, it is permissible for the student, when he hears ḥadīth by himself, to say, "He transmitted to us," or something similar, because in the speech of the Arabs that is permissible for a single individual. Furthermore, he is permitted, when he hears ḥadīth as a part of a group, to say, "He transmitted to me," because the teacher did transmit to him as well as transmitting to the others. God knows best.

(d). We heard that Abū 'Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, "Follow the speech of the teacher in regard to his saying, 'He transmitted to us,' 'He transmitted to me,' 'I heard,' and 'He informed us,' and do go beyond it." For the material you find in the books composed of the transmissions of people earlier than you, you may not change the ḥadīth indicated with "He informed us" in that very book to "He transmitted to us," and the like. That is because, if there exists a disagreement over putting one term in the place of the other and there exists a precedent for making a distinction between them, it is possible that the person using one of them is one of those who does not regard them as equivalent. If you were to find an isnād of that description and you knew that its transmitters regarded the terms as equivalent, then your replacing one of them with the other would come under the heading of permitting transmission by paraphrase. This

43 *Kifāya*, 294.

44 *Kifāya*, 294.

would be true, even if there were a well-known difference [between the terms, observed by others]. We think it best to avoid doing anything along these lines in regard to changing the contents of books and collections of ḥadīth, as we will (God – He is exalted – willing) discuss below.

What Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said in his *Kiṣāya*<sup>45</sup> about doing that is disputed and in our view it refers to the ḥadīth a student hears from the speech of a transmitter and not something recorded in a written composition. God knows best.

(c). Scholars disagree over the soundness of the audition of someone who copies at the time of the recitation. It is reported that the authority Ibrāhim al-Ḥarbi;<sup>46</sup> the expert Abū Aḥmad b. ‘Adī;<sup>47</sup> the professor Abū Ishāq al-Isfārāyīnī<sup>48</sup> – the expert in practical and theoretical law – and others rejected it. We heard that Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Ishāq al-Ṣibghī<sup>49</sup> – one of the authorities of the Shāfi‘ites in Khurāsān – was asked about the student who writes during audition. He said, “He should say, ‘I attended’ (*haḍartu*), and not, ‘He transmitted to us,’ or, ‘He informed us.’” It is reported that Mūsā b. Hārūn al-Hammāl permitted copying during the audition and that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī said, “I wrote in ‘Ārim’s<sup>50</sup> class while he was reciting and I wrote in ‘Amr b. Marzūq’s class while he was reciting.” It is also reported that one text was recited to ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak while he copied another. There is no difference between the copying of the auditor and the copying of the person who validates the audition (*musammi‘*).

Making a distinction is superior to these blanket declarations. Our opinion is that the audition is not valid when the copying is such that the student cannot comprehend what is being recited, so that sound which reaches his ears is like background noise. The audition is valid if, while copying, comprehension is not impossible for him, as was the case in what we heard regarding the ḥadīth expert and scholar Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqutnī. In his youth, he attended the class of Ismā‘il al-Ṣaffār.<sup>51</sup> He sat copying a volume in his possession while Ismā‘il was

45 This may refer to *Kiṣāya*, 309–10.

46 Abū Ishāq Ibrāhim b. Ishāq b. Bashir al-Ḥarbi (198/813–280/894) was an expert in ḥadīth and law who is perhaps best known for having written a book on the rare words appearing in the ḥadīth (*gharib al-hadīth*); Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 13:356–72.

47 Abū Aḥmad ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Adī al-Jurjānī (277/891–365/976) wrote a famous book on weak ḥadīth transmitters entitled *al-Kāmil Fi ḏu‘afā’ al-rijāl*, 7 vols (Beirut, 1404/1984); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:198–9.

48 Abū Ishāq Ibrāhim b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhim al-Isfārāyīnī (d. 418/1027) was one of the most prominent Shāfi‘ites of his era; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:353–5.

49 Ṣibghī (258/872–342/953) combined expertise in law and ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 15:483–9.

50 ‘Ārim (ca. 140/757–224/839), whose real name was Abu ‘l-Nu‘mān Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl al-Sadūsī, was a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth whom Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī studied with in 214/829; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:265–70.

51 Abū ‘Alī Ismā‘il b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī al-Ṣaffār (247/861–341/952) was a transmitter of ḥadīth also known for his knowledge of the Arabic language; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 15:440–1.

dictating. One of those in attendance said to him, “Your audition is not valid while you copy.” Dāraqutnī replied, “My comprehension of the dictation is different from yours.” Then Dāraqutnī said to the man, “Do you recall how many ḥadīth the teacher has dictated until now?” He said no. Dāraqutnī said, “He has dictated eighteen,” and the ḥadīth were counted and found to be as he said. Then Dāraqutnī said, “The first ḥadīth was from X from Y and its text read such and such. The second was from A from B and its text was such and such.” He kept giving the isnāds and texts of the ḥadīth in the order they were dictated until he reached the last of them. The people were astonished by him. God knows best.

(f). The distinction which we described in regard to copying applies equally to the cases when the teacher or the auditor is holding a conversation, or the reciter speaks too quickly or murmurs so that some of the words are inaudible, or the auditor is too far from the reciter, and similar cases. It is obvious that in, each of these cases, missing a small amount – a word or two – may be excused. [If this is the case,] it is recommended that the teacher permit all of the auditors to transmit the entire volume or book which they heard, even if the term “audition” (*samā'*) is to be applied to all of it. When he grants his written authorization (*khaṭṭ*) for that book to one of them, he should write: “He heard this book from me and I hereby give him permission to relate it from me,” or something like this, just as some of the earlier teachers used to do. One of the things we hear from the Andalusian jurist Abū Muḥammad b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Atṭāb<sup>52</sup> was that his father<sup>53</sup> (God be pleased with both of them) said, “In audition licensing is indispensable, because sometimes the reciter makes mistakes and the teacher ignores it; or the teacher makes mistakes, if he is reciting, and the auditor ignores it. So the portion the student missed is restored to him by the licensing.” What we have mentioned is an excellent solution. Indeed, we heard that Ṣalīḥ b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal<sup>54</sup> (God bless them) said, “I said to my father, ‘When the teacher slurs a word – it is known to be such and such and this is not understood from him – do you think that the student should relate the correct wording from him?’ He said, ‘I hope that there will be no difficulty in his doing that.’”

On the other hand, we read that Khalaf b. Sālim al-Mukharrimi<sup>55</sup> said, “I heard Ibn ‘Uyayna saying, ‘Amr b. Dīnār to us’ (*nā ‘Amr ibn Dīnār*), meaning ‘Amr b. Dīnār transmitted to us’ (*haddathānā*); however he

<sup>52</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Atṭāb al-Qurṭubī (433/1041–520/1126) was one of the great ḥadīth transmitters of al-Andalus; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 19:514–15.

<sup>53</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Atṭāb b. Muhsin (383/994–462/1069) was an expert in a number of disciplines; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:328–30.

<sup>54</sup> Abu ‘l-Faḍl Ṣalīḥ (203/818–265/878) was one of the two talented sons of the imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal who played a large role in the propagation of his teaching; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:510.

<sup>55</sup> Abū Muḥammad Khalaf b. Sālim al-Mukharrimi al-Baghdadī (d.231/846) was considered to be an expert in ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:148–50.

limited himself to the *nūn* and *alif* of *ḥaddathanā*. When he was told, ‘Say, “‘Amr transmitted to us,”’ he said, ‘I will not say it, because I did not hear three letters of his utterance of *ḥaddathanā* – and they were *ḥaddatha* – on account of the great crowd.’”

The crowds in the classes of many of the greatest transmitters of ḥadīth used to be very large, sometimes reaching thousands and thousands. Repetitors (*mustamlūn*) conveyed the ḥadīth from the teachers to the crowds so the students actually wrote the ḥadīth down from the teachers through the intermediary of the conveyance of the assistants. More than one of the experts permitted students to relate that material from the dictator [without mentioning the intervening repetitor]. We heard that al-A‘mash (God be pleased with him) said, “We were attending the class of Ibrāhīm [al-Nakha‘ī] and the teaching circle became very large. Many times he related a ḥadīth and those at a distance from him could not hear it, so they asked one another what he had said. Then they related these ḥadīth [directly from him] as well as those they actually did hear from him.” We heard that a man asked Ḥammād b. Zayd about a similar situation, saying, “Abū Ismā‘il, what is your opinion?” He said, “Ask those around you.” We also heard that the repetitor Abū Muslim<sup>56</sup> said to Ibn ‘Uyayna, “Many of the people cannot hear the ḥadīth.” He said, “Can you hear them?” He said yes and Ibn ‘Uyayna replied, “Then make them hear them.”

Others rejected that. We heard that Khalaf b. Tamīm<sup>57</sup> said, “I heard about ten thousand ḥadīth from Sufyān al-Thawrī and I used to ask my companion in class [for the ones I did not hear clearly]. I told that to Zā‘ida and he said to me, ‘Transmit from these ḥadīth only what you have preserved with your heart and heard with your own ears.’ So I cast them away.” We also heard that Abū Nu‘aym [al-Faḍl b. Dukayn] felt it necessary to transmit from his fellow students the ḥadīth from Sufyān and al-A‘mash from which he missed a single word or name he had to ask his fellows for, not linking that anything else was possible for him.

The first view<sup>58</sup> represents an extreme lack of rigor. Indeed, we heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda al-İsbahānī said to one of his students, “X, for you smelling a ḥadīth is enough for audition!” This statement should either be interpreted [to refer to something else] or be left with the person who said it. I found from the expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa‘īd<sup>59</sup> from the expert Ḥamza b. Muḥammad<sup>60</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Bukhari, *Tarikh al-kabir*, 3(1):383; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(2):317.

<sup>57</sup> Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Khalaf b. Tamīm al-Tamīmī al-Kūfī (d. 213/828) was a well-respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:21–3.

<sup>58</sup> Ibn al-Şalāh seems to have in mind here the views of Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī and Ḥammād b. Zayd, who, it would appear, allowed the student to transmit any amount of material directly from the teacher without mentioning the intermediary whom he had to consult.

<sup>59</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa‘īd al-Azdī al-Miṣrī (332/944–409/1018) appears to have been a very important figure in the history of ḥadīth scholarship, although none of his surviving works have been published yet; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:223–5.

<sup>60</sup> Abū Muḥammad Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Kinānī (275/888–357/968) was a scholar of ḥadīth born in Egypt; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:192–3.

— with his isnād — that ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdī said, “Smelling a hadith is enough for you.” ‘Abd al-Ghanī said, “Hamza said to us, “‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi means that when that person was asked about the beginning of something [that is, a ḥadīth], he recognized it. It does not refer to laxity in audition.”” God knows best.

(g). Audition from someone behind a barrier is valid, if, when he relates the ḥadīth personally, his<sup>61</sup> voice is recognized. It is also valid when the ḥadīth are being recited to him, if his presence behind the barrier is known to one of those being granted the audition by him. For recognizing the teacher’s voice or presence, one should be permitted to rely upon the word of someone trustworthy. They used to hear ḥadīth from ‘A’isha and the other wives of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from behind a barrier and they related these ḥadīth from them on the basis of their voice. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa’id cited as proof of the permissibility of this practice the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Bilāl will call out at night, so eat and drink until Ibn Umm Maktūm calls out.”<sup>62</sup> ‘Abd al-Ghanī also related, with his isnād, that Shu’ba said, “When someone transmits ḥadīth to you and you do not see his face, do not relate from him. Perhaps it is a devil who has taken his shape,”<sup>63</sup> saying, ‘He transmitted to us’ and ‘He informed us.’” God knows best.

(h). When a student hears a ḥadīth from a teacher and the teacher then says to him, “Do not relate it from me,” or “I do not grant you permission to relate it from me;” or he says, “I did not inform you of it” — or “I recant from my informing you of it” — “so do not relate it from me,” without his ascribing that to his having made an error in the ḥadīth, having doubts about it or something like that — but rather he forbids the student to relate from him despite being unequivocal that it is his ḥadīth: that does not nullify the student’s audition or form an obstacle to the student’s relating from him. The expert Abū Sa’id b. ‘Aliyak al-Nisābūri<sup>64</sup>

61 Despite the masculine pronouns, it is a question of women here. They normally transmitted out of the view of their male students.

62 Although the interpretation of this report was not disputed, the justification of this interpretation was. Ibn Umm Maktūm — the other elements of his name are variously given, see Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 1:360–5 — and Bilāl shared the duty of calling the Muslim Community to prayer during the lifetime of the Prophet. The text refers to the fast of the month of Ramaḍān when Muslims are permitted to eat and drink only between the evening and the dawn prayer. Suyūṭī (*Tadrib al-rāwī*, 2:28) pointed to the fact that people who could not see Ibn Umm Maktūm were obliged to act upon his call to prayer. Noting that Ibn Umm Maktūm had lost his sight as a child, Ibn Ḥajar (*Nukat*, 2:879) argued that he was therefore obliged to rely on the voice of a person whom he could not see to learn of the advent of daylight.

63 As Sakhawī points out, it would have made slightly better sense if Shu’ba had said “voice” (*ṣamī’*) here rather than “shape” (*sūra*); *Fath al-Mughīth*, 2:52.

64 Abū Sa’id (or Abū Sa’d) ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥusayn (or al-Ḥasan) b. ‘Aliyak al-Nisābūri was a ḥadīth collector who died in 431/1039 at an advanced age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:509.

asked the professor Abū Ishaq al-Isfārāyīnī (God bless both of them) about the transmitter who intends his audition for a particular group and someone else comes and hears ḥadīth from him without his knowledge of it: “Is it permissible for that unintended student to transmit the ḥadīth from him?” He answered that it is permissible and that even if the transmitter had said, “I am informing you and I am not informing X,” it would not harm X. God knows best.

III Licensing (*ijāza*) is the third means of conveying and receiving ḥadīth. It takes several forms.

(a). Licensing a specific text to a specific person: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license book X” – or “the contents of this book list of mine (*fīhrīstī*<sup>65</sup>)” – “to you.” This is the highest form of licensing lacking the transference of the text (*munāwala*). Some claim that there is no dispute regarding the permissibility of this form of licensing and that the Zāhirites did not dispute it; rather their dispute was over some other type of transmission. The judge Abu 'l-Walid al-Bājī al-Mālikī<sup>66</sup> went further and categorically denied the existence of any dispute. He said, “There is no dispute regarding the permissibility of transmitting by license among the forebears of this Community or their successors,”<sup>67</sup> and he asserted that there was total unanimity on this. He then mentioned the dispute over whether one could *act upon* the material transmitted this way. God knows best.

This is false. Large numbers of ḥadīth scholars, jurists and legal theorists have indeed held contradictory opinions over the permissibility of transmitting by license. The view which holds licensing as invalid is represented in one of the two transmissions from Shāfi'i (God be pleased with him) on that topic. It was related that his disciple al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān<sup>68</sup> said, “Shāfi'i did not use to allow licensing for ḥadīth, and I disagree with Shāfi'i on that.” A number of other Shāfi'ites, including the judges Husayn b. Muḥammad al-Marwādī<sup>69</sup> and Abu 'l-Hasan al-Māwardī,<sup>70</sup> regarded licensing as invalid. Māwardī stated as much unequivocally in his *al-Hāwi* and traced it back to the doctrine of Shāfi'i.

<sup>65</sup> *Fīhrīst*, *fahras*, *thabat* and *barnāmaj* were names applied to the works listing the books a scholar was permitted to transmit and the teachers from whom he received them; *EP*, 2:743–4, s.v. *Fahrasa*.

<sup>66</sup> Sulaymān b. Khalaf b. Sa'd (403/1013–474/1081) was a renowned Andalusian scholar who wrote works in a number of disciplines, including ḥadīth and law; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:535–45.

<sup>67</sup> Al-Qādī Iyād, *Ilmāt*, 89.

<sup>68</sup> Abū Muḥammad al-Rabī' b. Sulaymān al-Murādī (ca. 174/790–270/884) was one of the pupils of Shāfi'i most responsible for preserving his teachings; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:587–91.

<sup>69</sup> Abū 'Alī Husayn b. Muḥammad al-Marwādī (d. 462/1069) was one of the great Shāfi'ite scholars of Khurāsān; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:260–2.

<sup>70</sup> The career of Abū 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. Ijabib al-Māwardī (364/974–450/1058) reached its apogee when he was appointed the chief judge of Baghdad. Among his works on Shāfi'ite law is *Kitāb al-Āhkām al-sulṭāniya*, a seminal work on public law; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:64–7.

Both of them said, "If licensing were licit, traveling to collect ḥadīth would become pointless." This expression is also related from Shu'ba and others. The authority Ibrāhīm b. Ishaq al-Ḥarbi, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-İsbahānī<sup>71</sup> – nicknamed "Abu 'l-Shaykh" – and the expert Abū Naṣr al-Wā'ilī al-Sijzī were among the scholars of ḥadīth who regarded licensing as invalid. Abū Naṣr related declarations of its incorrectness from a number of those he met, saying "I heard a number of scholars saying, 'The implication of a transmitter saying, "I hereby license you to relate from me," is I hereby license you to do something which is not allowed by the law, because the law does not permit the transmission of material which was not heard.'" Similar to this is what Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Thābit al-Khujaṇdī<sup>72</sup> – one of the Shāfi'ites who regarded licensing as invalid – related from Abū Tāhir al-Dabbās<sup>73</sup> – one of the authorities of the Ḥanafites. He said, "When someone says to someone else, 'I hereby license you to relate from me what you did not hear,' it is like his saying, 'I hereby license you to ascribe lies to me.'"

The established practice and the doctrine of large numbers of scholars of ḥadīth and others are in favor of permitting licensing and allowing transmission on the basis of it. However, there is some obscurity in the argument made for this. We may say: when the teacher licenses the student to relate his transmissions from him, he has communicated them to him collectively (*jumlatan*), and it is the same as if he had communicated them to him word by word (*tafsīlan*). As in the case discussed above regarding "recitation to the teacher,"<sup>74</sup> the validity of the teacher's communicating his transmissions to his students does not rest upon his explicit verbal declaration. Rather, the aim is for the teacher to make the student understand [that this is the material he transmits<sup>75</sup>] and for the student to comprehend this; and that occurs through the act of licensing which creates this understanding. God knows best.

Just as relation on the basis of licensing is permitted, acting upon the material transmitted that way is necessary. This is in conflict with the doctrine of those Zāhirites and the others who have followed them who held that it is not necessary to act upon it, and that a ḥadīth transmitted this way is the same as a loose ḥadīth (*mursal*). This is incorrect, because there is nothing in the act of licensing that impairs the cohesiveness or trustworthiness of the material transmitted in this way. God knows best.

<sup>71</sup> Abū 'l-Shaykh (274/887–369/979) was one of the greatest scholars of ḥadīth of the fourth/tenth century; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:200–1.

<sup>72</sup> Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Latīf b. Muḥammad b. Thābit al-Khujaṇdī taught in the Niẓāmiya in Baghdad and died in a village near Hamadhan in 552/1157; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:386–7.

<sup>73</sup> Abū Tāhir Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Sufyān al-Dabbās (d. ca. 340/951) was one of the most prominent Ḥanafites in Iraq; Lakhnawī, *Fawā'id*, 187.

<sup>74</sup> See p. 103.

<sup>75</sup> See Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:64.

(b). Licensing an unspecified text to a specific person: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license everything I heard”— or “everything I relate” — “to you,” or something similar. The dispute over this type of licensing is stronger and more common. The majority of scholars, including transmitters of ḥadīth, jurists and others, permit transmitting by this means as well as the first and also deem it necessary to act on the material related in this way in accordance with its stipulation.<sup>76</sup> God knows best.

(c). Licensing an unspecified person under a general designation: for instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license the Muslims,” or “I hereby license everyone,” or “I hereby license my contemporaries,” or something similar. This is a form which the modern proponents of permitting licensing in principle discussed and the permissibility of which they disputed. If it is coupled with a restrictive designation or the like, it is more likely to be permitted. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb was one of those who permitted every form of it.<sup>77</sup> We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Manda said, “I hereby license everyone who says, ‘There is no God but God.’” According to what al-Khaṭīb related, the judge Abu ‘l-Tayyib al-Ṭabarī<sup>78</sup> – one of the expert jurists – permitted the licensing of all Muslims alive at the time the act of licensing takes place.<sup>79</sup> Abū Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd<sup>80</sup> – one of the greatest of the teachers of al-Andalus – licensed every student of ḥadīth who entered Cordova. A number of scholars, including Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Attāb (God be pleased with them), concurred with him in permitting that. Someone who asked Abū Bakr al-Ḥāzīmī<sup>81</sup> about this form of global licensing (*al-ijāza al-‘āmma*) told me that one of things he said in reply was that the experts of his time, like the expert Abu ‘l-‘Alā<sup>82</sup> and others, leaned towards permitting it. (God knows best.) We have not seen nor heard of anyone who is

76 *Bi-sharḥih*: It is difficult to determine what this phrase refers to. Nawawī omits it in his abridgement and most commentators ignore it. Sakhawī suggests that it is “the stipulation of licensing” (*shart al-ijāza*) to be discussed below; Sakhawī, *Fatḥ al-Mughīth*, 2:66 (and repeated in Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, *Fatḥ al-Bāqī*, 2:64). This would appear to be the stipulation – which Ibn al-Ṣalāh rejects (see below, p. 117) – that licensing is valid only when “the licensor is knowledgeable regarding what he is licensing and the licensee is a scholar.”

77 *Al-Ijāza li-‘l-ma‘dūm wa-‘l-majhūl* in Subḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrā’ī, *Majmū‘at rasā'il fi ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth* (Medina, 1389/1969), 80.

78 Abu ‘l-Tayyib Tāhir b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭabarī (348/959–450/1058) was an important Shāfi‘īite jurist; *EF*, 10:15–16; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:502; *EIr*, 1:390.

79 *Ijāza*, 80.

80 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘īd al-Shantajālī al-Qurṭubī was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth who spent a number of years in Mecca. He died in Cordova in 436/1045; Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb al-Ṣīla*, 2 vols (Cairo, 1966), 1:271–3.

81 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Muṣā b. ‘Uthmān al-Ḥāzīmī (548/1153–581/1185) was a Shāfi‘īite who settled in Baghdad. He specialized in ḥadīth and his most famous works may be *Kitāb al-Nāsikh wa-‘l-mansūkh* and *Shurūt al-‘āmma*; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 21:167–72.

82 Abu ‘l-‘Alā’ al-Ḥasan b. Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan al-Hamadhānī (488/1095–569/1173) was an expert in ḥadīth and in several other religious sciences; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 21:40–7.

worthy of emulation actually using this form of licensing and relating by it, not even the small group of late-comers who viewed it as valid. Licensing in principle is a weakness. By this extension and relaxation, it becomes a much greater weakness which should not be tolerated. God knows best.

(d). Licensing an unknowable person (*majhūl*) or an unknowable text, and the question of an act of licensing bearing a condition, are appended to this discussion: for instance, the teacher says, "I hereby license Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Dimashqī," and at that time there are a number of people who share this name (*ism*) and lineage (*nasab*) and the one being licensed is not specified. Or the teacher says, "I hereby license X to relate from me *Kitāb al-Sunan* (*The Book of Sunnas*)," and he transmits a number of books of sunnas known by this title and he does not specify which is meant. This is a defective and worthless form of licensing.

This is not the same as the case when someone licenses a number of people whose name and lineage are specified, while he is ignorant of their identity and is not acquainted with them. That does not impair the validity of the licensing, just as a teacher not knowing a student who attended his class does not affect the validity of that student's audition. (God knows best.) Even if the teacher licenses those whose names are designated in a letter requesting licensing (*istijāza*) and he is ignorant of their identity and their lineage, not even knowing how many of them there are and without having scrutinized their names one by one; the licensing should also be considered valid. This is analogous to the validity of the audition of those who attended a teacher's class to hear ḥadīth from him, even if the teacher does not know them at all, does not know how many of them there are and does not scrutinize their persons one by one.

When the teacher says, "I hereby license whomever X wants," or the like, it contains unknowability (*jahāla*) [in regard to the identity of the individuals being licensed] and the stipulation of a condition. So the presumption is that it is not valid. The judge Abu 'l-Tayyib al-Ṭabarī al-Shāfi'i gave a legal opinion to that effect, when the expert al-Khaṭīb asked him about this.<sup>83</sup> He reasoned that it is licensing an unknowable person and it is as if he had said, "I hereby license some people," without any specification. Sometimes it is argued that it is invalid because it also bears a condition. Whatever is vitiated by unknowability is also vitiated by the stipulation of a condition, according to what is known to be the opinion of some people. [The Shāfi'iite] al-Khaṭīb related that Abū Yaqṣā b. al-Farrā' al-Hanbali<sup>84</sup> and Abu 'l-Fadl b. 'Umrūs al-Malikī<sup>85</sup> permitted this form of licensing

<sup>83</sup> *Ijāza*, 81–2.

<sup>84</sup> Abū Yaqṣā b. Muḥammad b. al-Husayn b. Muḥammad al-Farrā' (380/990–458/1066) was a very prominent Ḥanbalite legal scholar in Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:89–91.

<sup>85</sup> Abu 'l-Fadl Muḥammad b. 'Ubayd Allah b. 'Umrūs al-Malikī (372/983–452/1060) was one of the leading Mālikite scholars in Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:73–4.

and these three were leaders of their respective schools at that time in Baghdad.<sup>86</sup> The unknowability in this form of licensing arises in the second part of the clause due to the presence of volition, in contrast to unknowability occurring in the case when the teacher licenses "some people." When the teacher says, "I hereby license whoever wants it," it is the same as if he had said, "I hereby license whomever X wants." (God knows best.) Rather, the former contains more unknowability and is more diffuse from the standpoint that – in contrast to the latter – it is conditional on the volition of innumerable people. This is also true in the case where the teacher licenses whoever wants to be licensed by him.

If the teacher licenses whoever desires to transmit from him, this is closer to being permissible because the delegation of transmission by the license to the volition of the licensee is a necessary component of every act of licensing. Despite the fact that this formula is in the form of a stipulation, it is merely a clarification of what is necessary to carry out the transmission and a description of the circumstance, and in reality there is no imposition of a condition.

For this reason, some Shāfi'i authorities permit the seller to say in a commercial transaction, "I hereby sell you this for such-and-such price, if you desire," with the purchaser saying, "I hereby accept."

The following was found in the handwriting of the expert Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Azdi al-Mawṣili:<sup>87</sup> "I hereby license the transmission of that to everyone who wants to transmit it from me." When the teacher says, "I hereby license such and such to X, if he desires to transmit it from me," or "to you, if you desire," or "you like," or "you want;" the most obvious and strongest view is that this is permissible, since the element of unknowability and the reality of the imposition of a stipulation have disappeared and only their form remains. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

(e). Licensing a yet-to-be-born person (*ma'ḍūm*), and let us discuss along with this the licensing of young children: this is a type of licensing which some modern scholars have discussed extensively and they have disagreed over its permissibility. An example of it is when you say, "I hereby license whoever will be born to X." If he links the yet-to-be-born person to a living person (*mawjūd*) by saying, "I hereby license X and whoever will be born to him," or "I hereby license you, your sons and your descendants for as long as they continue to reproduce;" it is closer to being permitted than the first example. For a similar reason, the Shāfi'iites permit the second kind and not the first in the establishment of a charitable trust (*waqf*). The Mālikites and Ḥanafites – or at least some of them – permit both kinds in a charitable trust. Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī

<sup>86</sup> *Ijāza*, 82.

<sup>87</sup> Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Azdi al-Mawṣili (d. 374/985) wrote works on a number of aspects of the study of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:199–200.

was one of the early ḥadīth scholars who performed this second kind of licensing. We heard that he was asked for licensing and said, “I hereby license you, your children and the offspring of the offspring,” meaning those who had not yet been born.

The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb deemed it permissible to license a yet-to-be-born individual in the first instance without any link to a living person.<sup>88</sup> He said that he heard Abū Yaqāb b. al-Farrā’ al-Hanbali and Abu ’l-Fadl b. ‘Umrūs al-Mālikī permitting that.<sup>89</sup>

The jurist Abū Naṣr b. al-Ṣabbāgh also related the permissibility of that. He said, “Some people are of the opinion that it is permissible to license someone not yet created. This is the opinion only of those who believe that licensing is the granting of permission (*idhīn*) to transmit and not an instance of face-to-face communication (*muhādathā*).”

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī then explained the argument for invalidating this kind of licensing, and this was the view his teacher, the judge and authority Abu ’l-Tayyib al-Ṭabarī, settled on.<sup>90</sup> That is the correct view and no other is appropriate, because licensing falls under the heading of communicating the licensed material collectively, as we said above in the discussion of the validity of the general principle of licensing. Just as communicating information to a yet-to-be-born person cannot be valid, licensing a yet-to-be-born person cannot be valid. If we had judged licensing to be granting permission, that would still not be valid for a yet-to-be-born person, just as granting permission in regard to the deputation of a yet-to-be-born person is not valid, because the yet-to-be-born person is in a state in which the act permitted was not valid from him.

This also necessarily renders void the licensing of a young child whose audition is not valid. Al-Khaṭīb said, “I asked the judge Abu ’l-Tayyib al-Ṭabarī about licensing a small child: ‘Is the child’s age or his capacity for discrimination taken into consideration for determining its validity in the way they are taken into consideration in determining the validity of his audition?’ He said, ‘They are not taken into consideration.’ I then said to him, ‘One of our colleagues said, “Licensing is not valid for those whose audition is not valid.”’ He said, ‘Sometimes it is valid for the teacher to license someone who is absent while that person’s audition would not be valid.’”<sup>91</sup> Al-Khaṭīb cited as evidence for the validity of licensing a child the fact that licensing is only the licensor allowing the licensee to transmit from him, and it is valid to allow someone who has reached the age of reason and someone who has not. He said, “In accordance with this, we saw all of our teachers licensing children who were absent, without inquiring about their age and level of discrimination. We never saw them under any circumstance license

<sup>88</sup> *Ijāza*, 81.

<sup>89</sup> *Ijāza*, 81.

<sup>90</sup> *Ijāza*, 80–81.

<sup>91</sup> *Kifāya*, 325.

anyone who was not yet born.”<sup>92</sup> It seems that they regarded a child fit for this way of receiving ḥadīth so that he could validly transmit on the basis of it after he had attained the qualifications necessary for transmitting. This arose from their desire to expand the means of perpetuating the isnād – which has been granted to this Community alone – and to bring the child closer to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God knows best.

(f). Licensing something the licensor has not yet heard or received at all to a licensee to relate when the licensor afterward receives it: someone who reported from the judge Ḥyāḍ b. Mūsā – one of the illustrious figures of his age in North Africa – informed me that he said, “I have not seen any of the teachers of old speak about this and I saw some of the modern scholars and our contemporaries doing it. It is said that Abu ‘l-Walid Yūnus b. Mughith<sup>93</sup> – the judge of Cordova – was asked to license all of the material he had related up to that date and all of what he would later relate, and he refused. The person who asked him became angry and one of his colleagues said to him, ‘He should give you something he has not taken? That is impossible!’” Ḥyāḍ said, “This is the correct view.”<sup>94</sup>

This view can be supported whether licensing is judged to be communicating the licensed material collectively or to be granting permission. If licensing is considered to be communication, this kind of licensing is not valid, because how can a person communicate something he has no information about? If licensing is considered to be granting permission, the invalidation rests upon the dispute over the validation of granting permission in deputation for something that the person giving the permission – the deputizer – does not yet possess. An instance of this would be someone appointing an agent to sell a slave which he intends to buy. Indeed, some Shāfi‘ites permitted that. The correct view is that this kind of licensing is invalid. So, it is incumbent on whoever wants to transmit by license from a teacher who has granted him license for, for instance, all of what he has heard to undertake an investigation in order to ascertain that the material he wants to transmit from him is something which the teacher heard before the date of the licensing.

When the teacher says, “I hereby license to you everything I heard which seems valid to you and will seem valid to you” (*ajaztu laka mā ṣahḥa wa-yaṣiḥḥu ‘indaka min masmū‘ati*), it is not like the above case. Indeed, Dāraqutnī and others did do this. It is permissible for the student to transmit from his teacher by virtue of that formula whatever after the granting of the license becomes established in his mind *as being something the teacher heard before the licensing*. That is permitted, even if the teacher

<sup>92</sup> *Kifāya*, 326.

<sup>93</sup> Abu ‘l-Walid Yūnus b. Mughith al-Qurṭubī (338/949–429/1038) held a number of positions of religious authority in Muslim Spain; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:569–70.

<sup>94</sup> *Ilmā‘*, 106.

says only, “everything which seems valid to you,” without, “and will seem valid.” This is because what is meant is, “I hereby license you to transmit from me everything which seems valid to you,” and the point to be taken into consideration in that case is the validity of that material in the student’s mind at the time he relates it. God knows best.

(g). Licensing previously licensed material: For instance, the teacher says, “I hereby license you the materials licensed to me,” or, “I hereby license you to transmit everything I was licensed to transmit.” Some modern scholars whose views are not taken into consideration have forbidden this. The correct view – and the one which is followed in practice – is that it is permissible. It is not comparable to the forbidden practice of deputizing an agent without the permission of the original deputizer. I read that the North African expert Abū ‘Amr al-Safāqusi<sup>95</sup> said, “I heard the expert Abū Nu‘aym al-İsbahānī<sup>96</sup> say, ‘Licensing on the basis of licensing is effective and permissible.’” The expert al-Khaṭīb related that the ḥadīth expert and authority Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Dāraqutnī, the expert Abu ‘l-‘Abbās – known as Ibn ‘Uqda al-Kūfī<sup>97</sup> – and others permitted it.<sup>98</sup> The jurist and ascetic Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm al-Maqdīsī<sup>99</sup> used to transmit by licensing from licensing, sometimes to the extent of putting together three consecutive licensings in his transmission.

The student who transmits previously licensed material on the basis of a license should study the particulars and dictates of the licensing granted by the teacher of his teacher in order that he does not transmit by it something that does not properly come under it. When, for example, the licensing of the teacher’s teacher takes the form, “I hereby license to him everything I heard which seems valid to him,” and the student has seen some of the material heard by the teacher of his teacher, he may not transmit this material from his own teacher from his teacher until it becomes clear that it is something which in the view of his teacher belonged to the material heard by the teacher who licensed him. The mere fact that the material now seems valid to the student is not enough to fulfill the words

95 Abū ‘Amr Uthmān b. Abī Bakr b. Ḥamūd al-Safāqusi was a fifth-/eleventh-century ḥadīth scholar who traveled extensively in the East and Andalusia before returning to North Africa; Ḥumaydi, *Jadhwat al-muqtabis fī dhikr wulāt al-Andalus* (Cairo, 1966), 303–4; Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Şila*, 2:408–11.

96 Abū Nu‘aym Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-İsbahānī (336/947–430/1038) was one of the great scholars of ḥadīth. He is best known for his biographical dictionary of the scholars of Isfahan, *Dhikr akhbār İsbahān* (ed. S. Dederling, 2 vols, Leiden, 1931), and his work on the most prominent Sufis, *Hilyat al-awliyā’ wa-jabaqāt al-āṣfiyā’* (Cairo, 1351/1932–1357/1938); *EI<sup>2</sup>*, 1:142–3; *EIr*, 1:354–5.

97 Abu ‘l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Sa‘īd b. ‘Uqda al-Kūfī (249/863–333/944) was a ḥadīth expert famous for his Shiīte leanings; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:182.

98 *Kifāya*, 349–50.

99 Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm al-Maqdīsī al-Nābulusī (before 410/1019–490/1096) was a very prominent Shāfi‘īte who ended his career in Damascus; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:136–43.

and stipulation of his teacher's teacher. The blunders of those who do not understand this and similar matters will be many. God knows best.

These are the types of licensing which require explanation, and other types can be derived from them. Those who study the matter will be able to figure out how the other types should be dealt with on the basis of what we have dictated, God (He is exalted) willing. We will now draw attention to some other matters.

1. We heard that the author and litterateur Abu 'l-Hasan Ahmad b. Fāris<sup>100</sup> (God bless him) said, "The meaning of 'licensing' (*ijāza*) in the speech of the early Arabs is derived from 'the giving of a quantity of water' (*jawāz al-mā'*) whereby the livestock and crops in someone's possession may be watered. It is said, 'I asked X to give me a quantity of water (*istajaztu*) and he gave me a quantity of water (*ajāzani*)', when he gives you water for your land and your livestock. In the same fashion, the student asks the scholar 'to give him a drink' of his knowledge and he 'gives him a drink' of it." In accordance with this interpretation, the licensor should say, "I hereby license X everything I heard" or "everything I relate" (*ajaztu fulānan masmū'ātī aw marmiyātī*), making it transitive, without any preposition, there being no need to mention the phrase "the transmission of" or anything similar. Those who equate "licensing" with allowing, granting permission or authorizing need to do that; and that is recognized. The licensor should then say, for instance, "I hereby license to X the transmission of everything I heard" (*ajaztu li-fulānin riwāyata masmū'ātī*). Some advocates of this view nevertheless say, "I hereby license to him everything I heard" (*ajaztu lahū masmū'ātī*). This is a form of ellipsis the like of which is not obscure. God knows best.
2. Licensing is recommended only when the licensor is knowledgeable regarding what he is licensing and the licensee is a scholar, because licensing is a facilitation and a concession suitable for scholars because of the pressing need for it. Some of them have gone too far in this regard and made this recommendation a stipulation (*shart*) for licensing. Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Walīd b. Bakr al-Mālikī<sup>101</sup> related such a view from Mālik (God be pleased with him). The expert Abū 'Umar [b. 'Abd al-Barr] said, "The correct view is that licensing is only permitted for the person skilled in the craft and for something specific, without problems in its isnād."<sup>102</sup> God knows best.
3. When the licensor writes his license, he should pronounce it out loud. If he merely writes it, it is still a permissible form of licensing when it is coupled with the intention of licensing. However, it is inferior in status to the license

<sup>100</sup> Ibn Fāris (d. 395/1005) was the author of numerous works on the Arabic language; Sezgin, *CAS*, 7:360–1, 8:209–14, 9:194.

<sup>101</sup> Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Walīd b. Bakr b. Makhlad al-Mālikī (d. 392/1002) was a well-traveled expert in ḥadīth and the Arabic language; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:65–7.

<sup>102</sup> *Jāmi'i bayān al-'ilm wa-saḍilihi*, ed. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb (Cairo, 1975), 480.

spoken out loud. Reckoning that kind of licensing as sound is not far-fetched, because merely writing the license belongs to the same class of transmission as “recitation to the teacher” which – although the teacher does not pronounce the material recited to him – has been made tantamount to his communicating to the student the material recited to him, as was explained above. God knows best.

IV Transference (*munāwala*) is the fourth means of receiving and taking up ḥadīth. It has two forms.

(a). Transference coupled with licensing: this is the absolutely highest kind of licensing. It takes several forms. One of them is the teacher handing the student the original text of his audition or a copy collated against it, saying, “This is my audition” – or “my transmission” – “from X. Transmit it from me” – or “I hereby license you to relate it from me,” and then placing it in his possession; or the teacher saying, “Take it, copy it, collate your copy against it and then return it to me,” or something similar.

Another form is the student bringing the teacher a book or personal collection of his ḥadīth and presenting it to him. The teacher – assuming he is cognizant and alert – examines it and returns it to him, saying to him, “I have read what is in this and they are my ḥadīth from X” – or “my transmission from my teachers is in it” – “so transmit it from me” – or “I hereby license you to transmit it from me.” Several of the authorities in ḥadīth have called this “presentation” (*ard*). In our earlier discussion of “recitation to the teacher,” we said that it is also called “presentation.” So let us call that “presentation by recitation” (*ard al-qirā'a*) and let us call this “presentation by transference” (*ard al-munāwala*). God knows best.

This transference coupled with licensing occupies the place of audition in the opinion of Mālik and a number of the authorities in ḥadīth.

The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī related from many of the early scholars that the aforementioned “presentation by transference” is equal to audition. This applies as well to similar forms of transference coupled with licensing. Among those from whom al-Ḥākim related this view were a number of Medinese, including Ibn Shihāb al-Zūhrī, Rabi‘at al-Ra‘y, Yahyā b. Sa‘īd al-Anṣārī and the imām Mālik b. Anas; some Meccans, including Mujaħid, Abu ’l-Zubayr [al-Makkī] and Ibn ‘Uyayna; some Kūfāns, including ‘Alqama [b. Qays] al-Nakha‘ī, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī and Sha‘bī; a group of Baṣrāns, including Qatāda, Abu ’l-‘Āliya<sup>103</sup> and Abu ’l-Mutawakkil al-Nājī;<sup>104</sup> a number of Egyptians, including Ibn

<sup>103</sup> Abu ’l-‘Āliya Rufay‘ b. Mihrān al-Riyāḥī converted to Islam in the caliphate of Abū Bakr and became one of the great experts in the proper recitation of the Qur‘ān. The sources date his death variously between 90/709 and 106/724; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:207–13.

<sup>104</sup> Abu ’l-Mutawakkil ‘Ali b. Dāwūd al-Nājī was an obscure transmitter who died in 102/720; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:8–9.

Wahb, Ibn al-Qāsim<sup>105</sup> and Ashhab;<sup>106</sup> and others in Syria and Khurāsān. Al-Ḥākim also saw that a number of his own teachers subscribed to that view.<sup>107</sup> There is some confusion in al-Ḥākim's discussion because he has in some cases confounded remarks regarding "presentation by recitation" with comments on "presentation by transference" and treated them the same.

The correct view is that "transference by presentation" cannot take the place of audition, and that it is inferior in status to verbal transmission and communication through recitation. Indeed, al-Ḥākim himself said about this kind of presentation, "The jurists of Islam who gave opinions over the permissible and the forbidden did not regard it as equal to audition. Shāfi‘ī, Awzā‘ī, Buwaytī,<sup>108</sup> Muzanī,<sup>109</sup> Abū Ḥanifa, Sufyān al-Thawrī, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Ibn al-Mubārak, Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā and Iṣhāq b. Rāhawayh advocated that opinion. We observed our authorities adhering and subscribing to it, and we do too."<sup>110</sup> God knows best.

Another form of transference with licensing is when the teacher "transfers" his book to the student and licenses him to relate it from him, and then the teacher keeps the book in his possession and does not give it to the student. Because the student does not come into possession of the material he receives and it is absent from him, this form of transference falls short of the previously mentioned ones. It will be permissible for the student to relate the material from the teacher when he takes possession of the book or a copy collated with it in a fashion which convinces him of its agreement with the material the license covered. However, this is still considered to be a form of licensing lacking actual transference. Thus, transference in a case like this hardly possesses any advantage over a case of licensing a specific text without the act of transference. Indeed, several jurists and legal theorists have concluded that it possesses no [special] efficacy or benefit. Nevertheless, the expert scholars of ḥadīth in early and modern times – or at least some of them – believe it to have a considerable advantage. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

Another form of transference with licensing is a student bringing a book or a personal ḥadīth collection to a teacher and saying, "This is your transmission, so transfer it to me and license me to transmit it," and the teacher agreeing to this without looking at the text and making certain that he transmitted all of it. This

<sup>105</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. al-Qāsim al-‘Utaqī (132/749–191/806) was a Mālikite legal scholar whose views are recorded in a *mudawwana*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:465–6.

<sup>106</sup> Abū ‘Amr Ashhab b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Qaysī (145/762–204/819) was an important Egyptian Mālikite legal scholar; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:466–7.

<sup>107</sup> *Ulam*, 257–8.

<sup>108</sup> Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā al-Buwaytī (d. 231/845) was one of the students of the imām Shāfi‘ī responsible for the spread of his teachings; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:491.

<sup>109</sup> Abū Ibrāhīm Ismā‘il b. Yaḥyā al-Muzanī (175/792–264/877) was a disciple of the imām Shāfi‘ī and his *Mukhtaṣar* is one of the fundamental works of Shāfi‘īte law; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:492–3.

<sup>110</sup> *Ulam al-hadīth*, 259–60.

[by itself] is impermissible and invalid. If the information and the knowledge of the student may be trusted, it is permissible to rely on him in that regard. This is a permissible form of licensing, just as reliance on a student is permissible in "recitation to the teacher" to the extent that he may be the one reciting from the original text, when he is someone whose knowledge and religion may be trusted. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (God bless him) said, "If the teacher were to say, 'Transmit the contents of this book from me, if they are my hadith. I am not responsible for any error or misapprehension,' that would be permissible and good."<sup>111</sup> God knows best.

(b). Transference without licensing: here the teacher transfers the book to the student – as described above in the beginning – merely saying, "These are my ḥadīth," or "my audition," without saying, "Transmit it from me," or "I hereby license you to transmit it from me," or something similar. This is a defective form of transference and transmission by it is not permissible. More than one of the jurists and legal theorists have found fault with the transmitters of ḥadīth who permitted it and allowed transmission by it. Al-Khaṭīb related that a number of scholars regarded it as sound and allowed transmission by it. We will mention – God (He is praised and exalted) willing – the opinion of those who permitted transmission on the basis of the teacher's mere declaration (*i'lām*) to the student that a particular book is what he heard from X. This form of transference is better than the declaration by itself and it is superior because of the element of transference it contains, since the act of transference itself is not devoid of the implication that the teacher is granting permission to transmit the text. God knows best.

#### *Remarks on the way a transmitter should express transference and licensing*

It is related that some early scholars and some of those who came after them permitted the unqualified application of "He transmitted to us" (*haddathānā*) and "He informed us" (*akhbaranā*) to transmission by transference. That is related from Zuhri, Mālik and others. It is in accordance with the doctrine of all of the scholars cited above who made "presentation by transference" coupled with licensing equivalent to audition. Something similar was also related from some people in regard to transmission by licensing. The expert Abū Nu'aym al-İsbahānī – the author of many works on the science of ḥadīth – used to apply "He informed us" without qualification to the ḥadīth he related by license. We heard that he said, "When I say, 'He transmitted to us' it is audition. When I say, 'He informed us,' without further qualification, it is an instance of licensing, even if I do not say, 'by licensing' (*ijāzatan*), 'by writing' (*kitābatan*), 'he wrote to me' (*kataba ilayya*), or, 'he granted me permission to transmit from him' (*adhina li fi 'l-riwāya 'anhu*)."<sup>112</sup> The historian Abū 'Ubayd Allāh

---

111 *Kifāya*, 328.

al-Marzubānī<sup>112</sup> – the author of a number of works of secular history – used to relate most of the material in his books by license without audition and he used to say for licensing, “He informed us,” without further elucidation. According to al-Khaṭīb, that was something for which Marzubānī was criticized.<sup>113</sup>

The sound and preferred view which the majority follow in practice and which the earnest and scrupulous have adopted is to forbid the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us,” “He informed us” and similar expressions to material received by transference or licensing and to designate that material with qualified versions of these expressions which indicate the true situation. The transmitter should say, “X informed us” – or “transmitted to us” – “by transference and by license” (*munāwatalatān wa-ijāzatān*), “He informed us by license,” “He informed us by transference,” “He informed us by granting permission (*idhnān*),” “Under his grant of permission is” (*fi idhnihi*), “One of the things he granted me permission for is” (*simā adhina li fihi*), or “One of the things which he gave me leave to transmit from him is” (*simā aṭlaqa li riwāyatāhū ‘anhu*). Or he should say, “X licensed to me” (*ajāza li fulān*), “X licensed me such and such” (*ajāzāni fulān kadhā wa-kadhā*), “X transferred to me” (*nāwalāni fulān*) and similar expressions.

Some people have designated licensing with terms which have not kept them safe from misrepresentation or at least a trace of it. Examples are someone saying for licensing, “He informed us verbally (*mushahāfatan*),” when the teacher had only spoken the license out loud to him; or, saying “X informed us by writing” – or “in what he wrote to me,” or “in his letter” (*fi kitābihi*) – when the teacher had only written out the license for him. Even if a number of modern ḥadīth scholars have employed these expressions technically, they are still not free of a trace of misrepresentation on account of the ambiguity they contain and their similarity to what a student says when the teacher writes the ḥadīth themselves to him in a letter.

It is reported that Awzā‘ī designated licensing by saying, “He apprised us” (*khabbaranā*) and he designated recitation to him by saying, “He informed us.” Many modern scholars have adopted the convention of applying “He told us” (*anba‘anā*) without further qualification to licensing, and that is the preference of al-Walīd b. Bakr – the author of *al-Wajāza fi [tajwiz] al-ijāza* (*The Epitome in [declaring] Licensing [to be Valid]*). In earlier times people viewed “He told us” as the same as “He informed us.” The exacting expert Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī inclined toward this when he used to say, “X told me by licensing” (*anba‘ani fulān ijāzatān*), and this also complies with the convention of modern scholars. (God knows

<sup>112</sup> Abū Ubayd Allāh Muḥammad b. Imrān b. Mūsā al-Marzubānī (290/903–384/994) was a Muṭazilite scholar from Baghdad who composed a vast number of books on historical and literary subjects; Brockmann, *GAL, Suppl.* 1: 190; *EF*, 6:634–5.

<sup>113</sup> *Ta’rīkh Baghdād*, 3:135–6.

best.) We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim (God bless him) said, “The view I prefer and the one which I saw most of my teachers and the authorities of my age following is for the student to say, “X told me,” for the material which was presented to the transmitter and which the transmitter orally licensed the student to transmit. The student should say, “X wrote to me,” for the material which the transmitter sent to him from another city without orally licensing him. We heard that Abū ‘Amr b. Abī Ja‘far b. Ḥamdān al-Nisābūri<sup>114</sup> said, “I heard my father saying, ‘Whenever Bukhārī says, “X said to me,” it is an instance of presentation and transference.’” It is reported that some transmitters expressed licensing by saying, “X informed us that (*anna*) Y transmitted to him” – or “Y informed him.” We read that the authority Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī preferred this or related it. This is terminology that does not even remotely indicate licensing. It is more appropriate for when the student hears only the isnād from the teacher and the teacher licenses to him the text which follows it. The word “that” in the phrase, “X informed me that Y informed him” implies the presence of the principle of communication, even if the informant treated the material collectively and did not mention it word by word.

Modern transmitters often indicate an instance of licensing which took place in the transmission of someone above the teacher who granted the audition to them with the word “from” (*an*). So when one of them is given audition by a teacher on the basis of his license from his teacher, he says, “I recited to X from Y.” If the student heard ḥadīth from his teacher on the basis of his teacher’s license from his teacher and there was no audition [between the student’s teacher and his teacher or] the student is in doubt [as to whether the transmission between his own teacher and his teacher was audition or merely licensing<sup>115</sup>], application of the word “from” is reasonable. “From” may be applied with equal accuracy to both audition and licensing. God knows best.

Be aware that the impermissibility of the unqualified application of “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” to licensing is not negated by the licensor granting permission to apply it, as some teachers are wont to do. When granting a license to someone, they say, “If the student wishes, he may say, ‘He transmitted to us’ and if he wishes, he may say, ‘He informed us.’” So let that be known. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

## V Correspondence (*mukātaba*) is the fifth means of conveying and taking up ḥadīth. It consists of the teacher sending some of his ḥadīth in his own handwriting

<sup>114</sup> Abū ‘Amr Muḥammad b. Abī Ja‘far Aḥmad b. Ḥamdān al-Nisābūri (283/896–376/987) was a famous ḥadīth transmitter from Nishapur who was also renowned as an expert in the Arabic language; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:204.

<sup>115</sup> Sakhāwī, *Fath al-Mughīth*, 2:120.

to an absent student, or the teacher writing them for him while he is present. Associated with this is the case when the teacher orders someone else to send the ḥadīth from him to the student. This means of receiving ḥadīth also takes two forms. One of them is correspondence without licensing. The second is correspondence coupled with licensing, with the teacher sending the ḥadīth to the student and saying, “I hereby license to you the material I wrote for you” (*ajaztu laka mā katabuhū laka*) – or “the material I sent to you” (*mā katabtu bihi ilayka*), or some other expression of licensing similar to this.

Many early and modern scholars, including Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, Maṇṣūr [b. al-Muṭamir] and al-Layth b. Sa‘d, permitted transmission by means of the first type of correspondence – and it is the case when the teacher limits himself to correspondence [that is, without licensing]. A number of the Shāfi‘ites subscribed to that opinion and one of them, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar al-Sam‘ānī, rated correspondence by itself stronger than licensing. Some legal theorists have also adopted this view. A number of others rejected it. Among the Shāfi‘ites, the judge Māwardī adopted the latter view and stated it unequivocally in his book *al-Hāwi*. The first doctrine is the correct one and it is well known among the adherents of ḥadīth. Often in their ḥadīth collections and writings one finds them saying, “X wrote to me (*kataba ilayya fulān*). He said, ‘Y transmitted to us,’” by which is meant correspondence. In their opinion, this is effective and the ḥadīth transmitted this way are connected supported (*al-musnad al-mawṣūl*). Correspondence itself contains a strong implication of licensing. Even if it is not explicitly coupled with licensing, it does imply the substance of licensing.

In the case of correspondence, it is enough that the student to whom the ḥadīth are sent recognize the handwriting of the correspondent, even if no clear proof that it actually is his handwriting exists. There are some people who say, “One person’s handwriting looks like another’s so it is not permissible to rely on that.” This is unsatisfactory, because it is rare that one person’s handwriting does resemble someone else’s. The presumption is that one person’s handwriting does not resemble anyone else’s and that there is no ambiguity about it.

More than one of the learned and leading scholars of ḥadīth, including al-Layth b. Sa‘d and Maṇṣūr, subscribed to the doctrine that it is permissible to apply “He transmitted to us” and “He informed us” without qualification to transmission by correspondence. The preferred position is the doctrine of those who say for it, “X wrote to me. He said, ‘Y transmitted to us such and such.’” This is the correct view and the one appropriate for those possessing earnestness and probity. It would be equally valid if they had said, “He informed me of it by correspondence” (*mukātabatān*) – or “in writing” or some other similar expression. Correspondence coupled with an explicit license is comparable to transference with licensing in terms of validity and efficacy. God knows best.

VI The sixth means of taking and conveying ḥadīth is the declaration of the transmitter (*i‘lām al-rāwī*) to the student that a particular ḥadīth or a particular book is his audition or his transmission from X, merely saying that without going

on to say, "Transmit it from me," "I hereby give you permission to transmit it," or the like. In the eyes of many, this is a permissible way to relate and convey such material. This view was related from Ibn Jurayj and certain other transmitters of ḥadīth, jurists, legal theorists and Zāhirites. The Shāfi'iite Abū Naṣr b. al-Šabbāgh stated it unequivocally and preferred it. Abu 'l-Abbās al-Walid b. Bakr al-Ghamri al-Mālikī supported him in his book *al-Wajāza fi tajwiz al-ijāza*. The judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād al-Rāmahurmuzī<sup>116</sup> – the author of the book *al-Fāsil bayn al-rāwī wa-'l-wā'i* – related that one of the Zāhirites subscribed to this doctrine and argued for it. He added, "If his teacher were to say to him, 'This is my relation, but do not transmit it from me,' he could still transmit it from him. Just as it would not affect him if he were to hear a ḥadīth from him and afterward he said to him, 'Do not transmit it from me,' or, 'I do not license it to you.'"<sup>117</sup>

The justification for the doctrine of these people is that they consider "declaration of the transmitter" to be equivalent to "recitation to the teacher." When the student recites some of the teacher's ḥadīth to him and the teacher silently assents that it is his transmission from X b. Y, it is permissible for the student to transmit the ḥadīth from him, even if he did not hear the ḥadīth from his teacher's lips and the teacher did not say to him, "Transmit it from me" or "I hereby grant you permission to relate it from me." God knows best.

The preferred view is the one ascribed to a number of the scholars of ḥadīth and others to the effect that transmission on this basis is not permitted. The Shāfi'iite teacher Abū Ḥāmid al-Tūsi<sup>118</sup> stated this unequivocally and did not mention any other possibility. This is because the material may be something the teacher heard and transmitted, but he does not grant permission for it to be transmitted from him, because he does not view its transmission as permissible on account of a defect he knows it to contain. His enunciation of the material is not present, nor anything equivalent to his enunciation of it. It is because of the enunciation of the reciter to him, while he is listening and silently assenting to it, that the transmitter from him who heard that may truthfully say, "He transmitted to me," or, "He informed us," even if the teacher did not grant him permission

<sup>116</sup> Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn b. 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Khallād al-Rāmahurmuzī (d. ca. 360/970) was a judge in Khūzistān who was an expert in ḥadīth and literature. His most famous work, *al-Muḥaddith al-fāsil*, is generally considered to be the first comprehensive work written in the genre of *uṣūl al-ḥadīth*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:193–4.

<sup>117</sup> *Muḥaddith al-fāsil*, 452.

<sup>118</sup> Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Tūsi, better known as Ghazālī, was born in Tūs in 450/1058. An outstanding career led him to the Niẓāmiya in Baghdad in 484/1091. Four years later in the midst of a spiritual crisis he resigned his post and became a mystic. In 499/1106 he returned to teaching, taking a post at the Niẓāmiya in Nishapur. He died in Tūs in 505/1111; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:535–46, *Suppl.*, 1:744–56; *EP*, 2:1038–41.

for that. Rather, in the case of “declaration of the transmitter” the transmitter is like a witness. When he gives testimony outside of the courtroom regarding some matter, it is not valid for someone who heard it to bear witness regarding his testimony, when he neither grants him permission to do so nor deputizes him to bear witness for him. This is one of the instances in which testifying in court and transmission are alike, because their substance unites them in that regard; even if they differ in other respects. Nevertheless, when the isnād is sound, the student must act in accordance with whatever his teacher mentions to him, even if his transmission from the teacher is not permitted. This is because the soundness of the ḥadīth in themselves is sufficient for that. God knows best.

VII Bequeathing books (*al-waṣīya bi-'l-kutub*) is the seventh of the categories of taking and receiving ḥadīth. It consists of a transmitter upon his death or upon his departure for a journey bequeathing to someone a book which he relates. It is related that some of the forebears (God be pleased with them) permitted the legatee to transmit such material from the bequeathing transmitter on that basis. This is highly implausible. It is either a lapse on the part of those scholars or interpreted to mean that they were referring to transmission by way of discovery (*wijāda*), which will be explained (God – He is exalted – willing). One scholar argued for the validity of this form of transmission and likened it to declaration and transference,<sup>119</sup> but that is not correct. There is a justification, which we mentioned, for the doctrine of those who permit transmission solely on the basis of declaration and transference. Nothing similar applies here and bequeathing is not close to either in that respect. God knows best.

### VIII Discovery (*wijāda*).

*Wijāda*, the verbal noun of *wajada* – *yajidu*, is a neologism unknown to the early Arabs. We heard from al-Muṣṭafā b. Zakariyā<sup>120</sup> al-Nahrawānī<sup>120</sup> – the great expert in a number of sciences – that later writers coined the word *wijāda* for reference to the knowledge taken from a written source (*sahīfa*) without audition, licensing or transference. This was done on the basis of the distinctions the early Arabs made between the various verbal nouns of *wajada* to discriminate between the different meanings of the verb. That is, when the early Arabs said, “He came across his camel which had strayed,” the verbal noun is *wijdān*; when they said, “He found the thing he was seeking,” the verbal noun is *wujūd*; for anger, the verbal noun is *mawjida*; for wealth, *wujd*; and for love, *wajd*.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>119</sup> Al-Qādi Iyād does this in *Ilmā'*, 115.

<sup>120</sup> Abu 'l-Faraj al-Muṣṭafā b. Zakariyā<sup>120</sup> al-Nahrawānī (305/917–390/1000) was a Baghdadi judge. He was the most prominent exponent of the legal doctrines of Ṭabarī of his time; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:522–3.

<sup>121</sup> For a more complete discussion of this, see Edward Lane, *Lexicon*, 8:2924.

An example of discovery is when a student comes across someone else's book in that individual's own handwriting containing some ḥadīth which he relates, and the student has never met him – or he did meet him but did not hear from him the ḥadīth which he has found recorded in his handwriting – and he does not have a license from him or anything similar. He should say, "I found (*wajadtu*) in the handwriting of X" – or "I read in the handwriting of X," or "In the book of X in his handwriting is" – 'Y b. Z, informed us.'" Then he should mention his teacher and give the rest of the isnād and the text. Or he should say, "I found" – or "I read" – "in the handwriting of X from Y," and mention the person who transmitted to him and those above him. This has been continuously practiced in early and modern times. It falls under the heading of "interrupted" (*munqati'*) and "loose" (*mursal*), however it is tinctured with "cohesion" on account of the statement, "I found in the handwriting of X." Sometimes someone commits misrepresentation (*dallasa*) by saying regarding the individual whose handwriting he found, "From X," or, "X said." That is a disgraceful misrepresentation *when it is such that it falsely promotes the impression that he heard the material from the teacher*, as was discussed above in the Category on misrepresentation. Some people speak carelessly and unqualifiedly apply "He transmitted to us" or "He informed us" to instances of discovery. Whoever does that opens himself up for criticism.

When the student finds a ḥadīth in someone's composition and the composition is not in the handwriting of that individual, he should say, "X mentioned" – or "X said" – 'Y informed us,'" or, "X mentioned from Y." This is interrupted and does not contain any trace of cohesion.<sup>122</sup>

All of the above applies when the student is confident that it is the handwriting of the individual mentioned or his book. If this is not the case, then let him say, "It reached me from X" (*balaghani 'an fulān*), "I found from X" (*wajadtu 'an fulān*), or similar expressions. Or let him plainly indicate the means of transmission he relied upon in that regard by using the expressions of some earlier scholars; for example, "I read in the book of X in his handwriting and Y informed me that it was the handwriting of X" or "I found in a book which I thought was in the handwriting of X" or "In a book the writer of which says that he is X b. Y is" or "In a book which is said to be in the handwriting of X is."

When the student wishes to transmit ḥadīth from a book ascribed to an author, let him not say, "X said such and such," until he becomes confident of the authenticity of the copy by his own collation of it – or some other trustworthy person's – with numerous other texts. We indicated this earlier at the end of

122 Although there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the text here, later writers tended to postpone the treatment of the point addressed in this passage to the general discussion below of texts not in their author's handwriting; e.g. Ṭrāqī, *al-Tabsira wa-ṭ-tadhkira*, ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ṭrāqī al-Ḥusaynī, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 2:115.

Category 1. When that, or something like it, does not happen, let the student say, "It reached me from X that he said such and such," "I found in a copy of book X," or other similar expressions.

In these times most people have become lax, applying without qualification unequivocal terminology to this kind of material without research or verification. One of them reads a book ascribed to a certain author and transmits from it ḥadīth from the author without becoming certain of the authenticity of the copy, saying, "X said such and such" or "X mentioned such and such." The correct course is the one presented above.

If the reader is knowledgeable and astute to the extent that, for the most part, omissions, slips and transpositions are not hidden from him, we hope that he will be permitted to apply without qualification an unequivocal expression [like "X said" or "X mentioned"] to the material he relates from that transmitter. So far as I can tell, many authors have been pleased to do that for the material they transmitted from the books of other people. Knowledge is with God (He is exalted).

All of this discussion concerns the particulars of transmitting by means of discovery. In regard to the permissibility of putting into practice the discovered material one has confidence in, we heard from one Mālikite that most of the Mālikite transmitters of ḥadīth, jurists and others do not regard this as valid. It is said that Shāfi'i and certain of his thoughtful disciples endorsed the validity of acting on the material transmitted this way. One of the thorough Shāfi'i scholars in theoretical law unequivocally ruled in favor of the necessity of acting upon the material once confidence in the ascription is attained. He said, "If what we said were presented to the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth, they would reject it." The opinion he unequivocally gave in favor of it is the only one possible in later ages. If putting a doctrine into practice did depend on its proper transmission (*riwāya*), it would become impossible to act on transmitted material, because of the infeasibility of meeting the standards of transmission in our time. This was discussed earlier in Category 1. God knows best.

al-Fārisī informed us. He said, The expert Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī informed us. He said, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn b. Bishrān<sup>8</sup> informed us. He said, Abū 'Amr b. al-Sammāk<sup>9</sup> informed us. He said, Ḥanbal b. Iṣhāq<sup>10</sup> transmitted to us. He said, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad<sup>11</sup> transmitted to us. He said, al-Walīd – that is, Ibn Muslim<sup>12</sup> – transmitted to us. He said, “Awzā'i used to say, ‘This knowledge is a noble one which men received among themselves. When it went into books, those unworthy of it came among them.’” The disagreement over writing ḥadīth has disappeared and Muslims have come to agree unanimously on allowing and permitting it. If the ḥadīth had not been recorded in books, they would have become obliterated in later ages. God knows best.

Those who write and collect ḥadīth are under an obligation to focus their efforts on recording clearly the transmitted material they write down – or obtain in the handwriting of someone else – exactly as the transmitters related it, using the vowel signs and diacritical points necessary to eliminate ambiguity. Often someone confident of his intelligence and attentiveness is disdainful of this and that has unfortunate consequences. People are susceptible to forgetfulness and the first to forget was the first person. Providing the diacritical marks in a text prevents it from becoming unintelligible and marking the vowel signs prevents ambiguity. No one should concern himself with indicating those obvious things that are almost never doubtful. Indeed, whoever said, “Vocalize only what is obscure,” spoke well. I read in the handwriting of 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Baghdādī in his book *Simāt al-khaṭṭ wa-ruqūmuḥū*<sup>13</sup> (*The Characteristics and Forms of Script*) that scholars dislike marking the diacritical points and inflectional vowels unless the word is ambiguous. On the other hand, someone else recounted from some people that unambiguous words should be vocalized as well as the ambiguous. That is because the beginner and the non-expert in the discipline cannot distinguish an ambiguous word from an unambiguous one, or correct inflectional vowels from incorrect. God knows best.

The following is a discussion of some useful points related to the above:

8 Abu 'l-Ḥusayn 'Alī b. Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Bishrān (328/939–415/1024) was a well-respected transmitter in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:227.

9 Abū 'Amr Uthmān b. Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Daqqāq (d. 344/955), known as Ibn al-Sammāk, was a hadīth scholar in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:185–6.

10 Abū 'Alī Ḥanbal b. Iṣhāq b. Ḥanbal al-Shaybānī (193/809–273/886) was a cousin of the *imām* Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:510.

11 Abū Muḥammad Sulaymān b. Aḥmad al-Dimashqī was a respected transmitter of hadīth who could count a number of very distinguished scholars as his students. Late in his life he moved to Wāsiṭ and slid into a life of dissipation; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):3; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4 (1):101.

12 Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Walīd b. Muslim al-Umawī (119/737–195/810) lived in Damascus and was an expert in the hadīth of the Syrians; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:293.

13 I have not succeeded in identifying this individual. His book is described in Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:col. 1001.

1. One should take more care to clarify [with diacritical marks, vowel signs, and so forth] doubtful proper names rather than other doubtful words, because proper names cannot be figured out by the sense of the passage and their correct reading cannot be inferred from the context.
2. For ambiguous words, it is recommended that one clarify them first in the body of the text and then write them in unconnected letters<sup>14</sup> in the margin opposite that place in the text. This is the fullest way to make them clear and the way furthest from ambiguity. The diacritical points and vowel signs of other words sometimes intrude from above and below on the words which one clarifies within the lines of the text, especially when the handwriting is small and the lines are narrow. This is the advice of a number of careful scholars. God knows best.
3. Tiny handwriting is condemned when there is no reason requiring it. We heard that Ḥanbal b. Ishāq said, “Ahmad b. Ḥanbal saw me writing in a small hand and said, ‘Do not do that. The thing you need the most will betray you.’” We read that when one teacher saw an instance of small handwriting, he said, “This is the handwriting of someone who is not convinced that God (He is exalted) will provide a replacement [for the sheet of paper he was using].” A valid excuse for writing in a small hand is, for instance, that the writer does not find enough room on the paper, or that he is a traveler who needs to make his handwriting small so that the burden of his book will be lighter for him or something like that. God knows best.
4. Precision, without either excessive looseness or excessive compression,<sup>15</sup> is preferred in the student’s handwriting. We read from Ibn Qutayba<sup>16</sup> that ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb (God be pleased with him) said, “The worst handwriting is scrawling and the worst recitation is spluttering. The best handwriting is the clearest.” God knows best.
5. Just as the letters with diacritical points are made clear by pointing, so should the letters without diacritical points be fixed with a sign to indicate the absence of pointing. The way that people clarify these letters varies. Some invert the points, putting the points which belong above the pointed letters under the

<sup>14</sup> Sakhawi explains that in this way a further degree of clarity is attained since there are a number of Arabic letters which appear similar when written in connected form but differ considerably in their unconnected form; *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:149.

<sup>15</sup> For the meaning of *al-mashq wa-’l-taqīq*, see Sakhawi, *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:151 and Franz Rosenthal, “Abū Hayyān at-Tawḥīdī on Penmanship,” *Four Essays on Art and Literature in Islam* (Leiden, 1971), 29, n. 4.

<sup>16</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muslim b. Qutayba al-Dinawarī (213/828–276/889) was a polymath who made important contributions to a number of disciplines; *EP*, 3:844–7; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:161–5.

analogous unpointed letters. So they place points under *rā'*, *sād*, *tā'*, *'ayn* and the other unpointed letters like them. One of the practitioners of this said that the points under the unpointed *sin* should be spread out in a row while those which are over the pointed *shin* should be arranged like a tripod. Some people make the sign indicating the absence of pointing over the unpointed letters in the shape of a nail paring resting on its back. Some put under the unpointed *hā'* a small unconnected *hā'*, and do the same under the *dāl*, *tā'*, *sād*, *sin*, *'ayn* and the rest of the ambiguous unpointed letters. These are the widespread and well-known forms of the signs indicating that a letter is unpointed. There are also signs found in numerous old books which many people do not understand, like the sign of those who make a small line over an unpointed letter and that of those who put something shaped like a *hamza* under an unpointed letter. God knows best.

6. No one should employ a personal system of signs in his book which no one else can understand and which throws others into confusion. Some who collect in their book several different transmissions of a text and signal the relation of each transmitter with one or two letters from his name and the like do this. If the writer explains in the beginning or the end of his book what he means by those signs and symbols, there is no problem. Nevertheless, it is better that the writer avoid using symbols. He should write for each transmission the name of its transmitter completely in a shortened form and not merely write a sign for some of it. God knows best.

7. The student should place a circle between two ḥadīth to separate and distinguish them. We read that Abu 'l-Zinād, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq al-Ḥarbi and Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī<sup>17</sup> (God be pleased with them) were among the authorities who did that. The expert al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] recommended that the circles be hollow. When he collated the text, he put a dot in the circle that followed each ḥadīth he had finished collating or he drew a line through its center. He said, "Some scholars did not use to count something as part of what they had heard unless it was marked that way," or words to that effect.<sup>18</sup> God knows best.

8. It is reprehensible for someone to write a name like "Abd Allāh, the son of X, the son of Y" with *Abd* at the end of a line and the rest at the beginning of the next line. In the same way, it is reprehensible with "Abd al-Rahmān, the son of X" – and the rest of the names containing *Abd* with a name of God (He is exalted) – that the *Abd* be written at the end of a line with the name of God and the rest of the lineage at the beginning of the next line. Similarly, it is

<sup>17</sup> Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (ca. 224/839–310/923) was one of the greatest religious scholars in Islam. He composed significant works in a number of fields, including history, Qur'ān commentary, law and ḥadīth; *EI*, 10:11–15; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:323–8.

<sup>18</sup> *Jāmi'*, 136.

undesirable for “The Messenger … said” (*qāla Rasūl*) to be written at the end of a line with “of God, May God – He is exalted – bless and save him and his family (*Allāh iṣalla ḥalāhu ta‘ālā ‘alayhi ma-ālihi wa-sallama*), and the like, being written at the beginning of the next line. God knows best.<sup>19</sup>

9. The student should make sure to write “May God bless and save him” upon the mention of the name of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and not tire of repeating the invocation upon each repetition of it. Indeed, that is one of the greatest benefits which the collectors and copyists of ḥadīth can readily accrue and whoever neglects it misses a great opportunity. We have heard some good dreams regarding those who did that. Every time someone writes the invocation it is a prayer which he invokes anew, rather than words which he just transmits. For that reason, in this matter the copyist is not bound by what he is relating and is not limited to what appears in the original text. The same is true for praising God (He is praised) upon the mention of His name with “He is mighty and great” (*‘azza wa-jalla*), “He is blessed and exalted” (*tabāraka wa-ta‘ālā*) and similar expressions. When it is found that one of these invocations already appears in the relation, the care to set it down it and make it clear should even be greater.

Surviving documents in the handwriting of Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) show that he sometimes neglected to write the invocation after the mention of the name of the Prophet (Peace be upon him). The reason for that may have been that in this matter he preferred to limit himself to the text as it appeared in the transmission and attaching the invocations for every transmitter who preceded him was too much for him. Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “I read that he used to invoke blessings on the Prophet (Peace be upon him) verbally rather than in writing. Other early authorities disagreed with Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal in that matter. It is related that ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī and ‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-‘Anbārī<sup>20</sup> said, ‘We never gave up invoking the blessing on the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) in every ḥadīth we heard. Sometimes we were in a hurry and we would then leave spaces for the invocations in each ḥadīth in the book, so we could go back later to write them in.’”<sup>21</sup> God knows best.

<sup>19</sup> The fear here is that a reader could inadvertently interpret the expressions in an impious fashion. In the first case, if the reader did not see the previous line with *‘Abd*, he would read the blasphemous phrase, “God, the son of X, the son of Y, said.” In the second case, if he did not see “The Messenger of – said,” he would read the formula, “God, may God – He is exalted! – bless him and save him and his family,” which at best is theologically confusing.

<sup>20</sup> Abu ’l-Faḍl ‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-‘Anbārī (d. 246/860) was a ḥadīth expert from al-Baṣrà; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:302–3.

<sup>21</sup> *Jāmi‘*, 135–6.

In writing the invocations, the student should avoid two deficiencies: (a). writing them abbreviated in form, representing them symbolically with a couple of letters, or something similar; (b). writing them abbreviated in sense, not writing “and save him” (*wa-sallama*), although examples of this are found in the handwriting of some early scholars.

I heard Abu ’l-Qāsim [or Abu ’l-Fath or Abū Bakr] Mansūr b. ’Abd al-Mun’im and Umm al-Mu’ayyad bint Abi ’l-Qāsim,<sup>22</sup> through my recitation to them. They said, We heard Abu ’l-Barakāt ’Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāwī<sup>23</sup> verbally say, I heard the Qur’ān reciter Zarif b. Muḥammad<sup>24</sup> saying, I heard the expert ’Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq<sup>25</sup> say, I heard my father saying, I heard Ḥamza al-Kinānī saying, “I used to write ḥadīth and upon the mention of the Prophet, I wrote, ‘May God bless him,’ without writing ‘and save him.’” Then, I saw the Prophet (Peace be upon him) in a dream and he said to me, ‘Why do you not complete the invocation of blessings on me?’ After that I never wrote ‘May God bless him,’ without writing ‘and save him.’” It is also detestable for the student to limit himself to writing “May peace be upon him” (*‘alayhi ’l-salām*). God knows best.

10. The student should collate his book with the book that he actually heard (*asl samā’ihi*) and the book of his teacher (*asl shaykhihi*) which he is actually relating from him, even in a case of licensing. We heard that Urwa b. al-Zubayr (God be pleased with them) asked his son Hishām, “You wrote?” and he answered yes. Then Urwa asked, “Did you collate your book?” He answered no and Urwa replied, “You did not write!” We heard that the *imām* Shāfi’ī and Yaḥyā b. Abī Kathīr said, “Someone who writes and does not collate is like someone who uses the privy and does not wash afterwards.” We heard that al-Akhfash<sup>26</sup> said, “When a book is copied without collation and then another uncollated copy is made from that copy, the text stops being Arabic.”

The best collation is the student’s personal collation of his book against that of his teacher, in the presence of the teacher while he is transmitting the text to him from his own book, on account of the elements of care and exactitude which

22 Umm al-Mu’ayyad Zaynab bint Abi ’l-Qāsim ’Abd al-Rahmān (d. 615/1218) was transmitter of ḥadīth in Nishapur who was sought out by her contemporaries; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 22:85–6.

23 Abu ’l-Barakāt ’Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Furāwī was the grandfather of Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s teacher Manṣūr b. ’Abd al-Mun’im. He was a respected transmitter and died of starvation and exposure in 549/1155 during the attack of the Ghuzz on Nishapur; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 20:227–8.

24 Abu ’l-Hasan Zarif b. Muḥammad al-Ḥirṭ was a scholar of ḥadīth from Nishapur who died in 517/1124 at the age of eighty-eight; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 19:375–6.

25 This appears to be Abu ’l-Ḥasan ’Abd Allāh (or ’Ubayd Allāh) b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 462/1070), the son of Abū ’Abd Allāh b. Manda; *EP*, 3:863; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:355.

26 This al-Akhfash (literally, “dim-eyes”) appears to have been Abū ’Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. ʿImrān b. Salama (d. ca. 260/874), a grammarian, lexicographer and poet from Syria; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:241.

that procedure brings together from the two sides [that is, the student's eyes and his ears<sup>27</sup>]. The collation lacking these characteristics falls short of the level of the prescribed collation to the extent that it lacks them. What we mentioned is superior to the blanket declaration of the expert Abu 'l-Fadl al-Jārūdī al-Harawī:<sup>28</sup> "The most truthful collation is alone by yourself."

The auditors who do not possess a copy of the text should sit with someone else and look into his copy, especially if they want to transmit from it. Indeed, it has been related that Yahyā b. Ma'īn was asked about someone who did not look in the book while the transmitter was reciting: "Is it permissible for him to transmit that book from his teacher?" He said, "In my opinion it is not permissible, however the audition of the generality of teachers is that way." This is one of the dictates of those strict in transmission and their doctrine will be mentioned below (God – He is exalted – willing). The correct view is that this is not stipulated and the audition is valid, even if the student does not look in the book at all at the time of the recitation. Furthermore, it is not stipulated that the student personally collate his text. Rather, it is enough for him that his copy be collated with the original text of the transmitter, even if that does not take place at the time of the recitation and even if someone else does the collating, if that person is reliable and one may be confident that he will be accurate.

It is also permissible for the student's text to be collated against a copy (*fā'iq*) which had been collated in the prescribed manner with the text of his teacher, the text used in the audition. The same is true if he collates his text with the original text which the text of his teacher was collated with, because the desired aim is that the text of the student be in conformity with the text heard at his audition and the text of his teacher, irrespective of whether that occurs through an intermediary or not. This is not enough for those who say, "The student's collation with anyone but himself is not valid. He may not rely on anyone else and there must not be any intermediary between him and the book of the teacher. So let him personally collate his copy with the original, letter by letter, so that he becomes confident and certain that his copy agrees with the teacher's." This is an abandoned doctrine. It is one of the doctrines of strict scholars that is repudiated in our age. God knows best.

When the student does not collate his book against the original: the professor Abū Ishaq al-Isfārāyīnī was asked about the permissibility of a student's relation from a text of this description and he permitted it. The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb also permitted it and explained his condition. He stated that it is stipulated that the student's copy must be transmitted from the original and that, when he relates

27 See Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughīth*, 2:169–70.

28 Despite the inherent implausibility, the sources maintain that there were two ḥadīth scholars named "Abu 'l-Fadl Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Jārūdī al-Harawī" living a century apart. The first is known as "al-Shahīd" (the martyr) because he supposedly died a heroic death at the hands of the Qarmatians in Mecca in 317/930; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:538–40. The second is said to have died in 413/1023; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:384–6.

it, he must make clear that he did not collate it. He related that his teacher Abū Bakr al-Barqānī asked Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī, “May someone transmit something he wrote from a teacher and did not collate with his original text?” He said, “Yes, but he must make clear that he did not collate it.” Al-Khaṭīb said, “This is the doctrine of Abū Bakr al-Barqānī. He transmitted to us many ḥadīth for which he said, “X informed us, and I did not collate it with his original text.”<sup>29</sup> A third condition is also necessary and this is that the transmitter of the copy made from the original should not be poor in transmitting but should rather be a sound transmitter who makes few mistakes. (God knows best.) The student should also direct his attention to his teacher’s book vis-à-vis those above him, in a fashion similar to what we described in reference to his own book. He should also not be like certain students who regard as valid the audition of a book recited to a teacher from any copy which happens to be at hand. God knows best.

11. The preferred method of supplying a textual omission in the margins – and it is called an “addendum” (*laḥaq*) – is for the student to make a line going up from the spot of the omission in the line of text and then curve it for a short distance between the two lines of text in the direction of the spot in the margin where he will write the addendum. He should begin writing the addendum in the margin opposite the curved line. Let that be in the right margin. If it<sup>30</sup> is near the middle of the page, let the addendum be written – if there is room for it – going up toward the top of the page, and not down toward the bottom. When the addendum is two or more lines long, the student should not begin the lines going from the bottom to the top, but rather begin them going from the top to the bottom, so that the end of the lines is in the direction of the center of the page, when the insertion is on the right margin; and when they are on the left margin, their end is toward the edge of the page. “It is correct” (*sahḥa*) should be written at the end of the addendum. Some people write “It returned” (*raja‘a*) with “It is correct.”

At the end of the addendum, some people write the word which occurs next to it at the place of the insertion inside the text to indicate the continuity of the passage. This is the preference of some of the North African practitioners of this craft and that of an Easterner, the judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād<sup>31</sup> – the author of the book *al-Fāṣil bayn al-rāwī wa-’l-wā’i* – among certain others. That is not satisfactory, since many times words are actually repeated in a passage, so this repetition sometimes causes some people to think mistakenly that this is an instance of that. The judge Ibn Khallād also recommended in his book that the curve of

29 *Kifāya*, 239.

30 Although *sāqīt* would appear to be the logical antecedent here, the text requires a grammatically feminine form.

31 *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 606–7.

the line for supplying the omission be extended from its place in the text to connect it with the beginning of the addendum in the margin.<sup>32</sup> This is also unsatisfactory. While it does more clearly indicate where the addendum belongs, it blackens the book and marks it up, especially if there are many addenda. God knows best.

We recommended that the addendum be written going toward the top of the page, lest another omission should have to be supplied later. If the student were to write the first addendum going down toward the bottom, he would not find the margin opposite the next omission free for its addendum. When he writes the first addendum going up, he finds the opposite margin free for whatever omissions he encounters after that. We also said that he should supply the addendum on the right side, because, if he were to put it on the left, often another omission appears further on in the same line.<sup>33</sup> If he also puts the second addendum on the left side opposite the line, the two addenda will become mixed-up. If he supplies the second addendum on the right side, the curve for supplying the addendum on the left side and the one on the right side will meet or face each other such that it will look like the words between them are being struck out. On the other hand, when the student supplies the first addendum on the right side and then supplies the second on the left, they do not meet and no confusion is entailed. However, if the omission occurs at the end of the line, there is no reason then for not supplying it on the left, because of the proximity of the omission to the margin and because the above-mentioned justification no longer holds, since we do not fear the appearance of another omission further on in the same line. When the omission is at the beginning of the line, the necessity of supplying it on the right side is further confirmed on account of the issue of proximity we brought up, in addition to the other reasons discussed above.

Commentary, the notation of errors and variant readings from different transmissions or different copies of the text or similar material not part of the original text which is to be supplied in the margins: the expert al-Qādī Iyād (God bless him) held the view that a line of insertion should not be used for this kind of material. This way ambiguity does not arise with this foreign material being considered part of the original text. The line is to be used only for what belongs to the original text itself. However, to mark the word for which the additional material was intended, a sign like the "latch" (*dabba*) or the one indicating that the word is correct (*tashīḥ*)<sup>34</sup> is sometimes placed over it.<sup>35</sup> I say: the line of insertion is better and clearer. The character of this supplementary material inherently eliminates any ambiguity. This supplement differs from the other kind belonging to the original text in that the line of the latter comes between the two words

<sup>32</sup> *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 606–7.

<sup>33</sup> Arabic is written from right to left.

<sup>34</sup> For these signs, see the next section.

<sup>35</sup> *Ilmāt*, 164.

bracketing the omission and the line of the former occurs over the actual word for the sake of which the supplementary material in the margin is cited. God knows best.

12. One of the concerns of skillful and exact students is to take care in “marking as correct” (*tashīḥ*), “latching” (*taqibib*) and “marking as faulty” (*tamriḍ*). “Marking as correct” consists of writing “It is correct” (*sah̄ha*) above the reading or in its vicinity. This is done only for something that is correct in regard to transmission and sense but that is open to doubt or dispute. “It is correct” is written above it so that it be known that it has not been overlooked and that it has been accurately written and that it is correct in that form.<sup>36</sup>

The symbol of “latching” – it is also termed “marking as faulty” – is placed over a reading which is established as appearing that way from the standpoint of transmission, but is corrupt in form or sense, or is weak or defective. It may, for instance, be impermissible in terms of Arabic usage or seem odd to speakers of Arabic, with most of them rejecting it. It may also have been misread (*muṣahḥaf*) [by a previous copyist]; or one word or more may have been omitted from the passage; or something along those lines. A line, the beginning of which is like the letter *sād*, is extended above something like this. It is not written on the indicated word lest it be thought that the word is being struck out. It is like the letter *sād* of the word *sah̄ha* with an extension rather than the *hā’*. It is written in this way to distinguish between what is absolutely correct, from the standpoint of transmission and in other ways, and what is correct from the standpoint of transmission but not in any other way. For this reason, “It is correct” is not written in complete form over it. Writing the word “defective” (*nāqis*) over a defective word also indicates its faultiness and deficiency, despite the soundness of its transmission and relation. This alerts anyone who looks in the book that the copyist noticed the defective word and has conveyed it as he found it. Perhaps, someone else will give him a correct reading or the reading which does not now seem correct to him will seem correct later on. If he had changed the word and corrected it to the best of his understanding at the time, he would be liable to what has befallen more than one imprudent scholar who changed a text and the correct reading turned out to be the one they rejected and the corrupt reading the one they “corrected” it to.

In regard to calling that symbol a *dabba* [literally, a door latch or the piece of material patched over a crack or break; for example, in a vessel or a piece of wood], we read from the lexicographer Abu ’l-Qāsim Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad – known as Ibn al-Iflīlī<sup>37</sup> – that this is because the word

36 For an instance of this which found its way into a printed text, see Sakhawī, *Fath al-Mughith*, 3:13, l. 19.

37 Ibn al-Iflīlī (352/963–441/1050) combined expertise in grammar and lexicography with a broad knowledge of poetry and rhetoric. Qifṭī, *Inbāh al-ruwāh ‘alā anbā’ al-nuḥāh*, ed. Muḥammad Abu ’l-Fadl Ibrāhīm, 4 vols (Cairo, 1369/1950–73), 1:183–4.

is “locked up” by it and not readable, as if the door latch were locked. (God knows best.) Because the *dabba* occurs over a reading containing imperfections, it is also like the piece of material which is placed over a crack or break. So the name of this symbol was taken from that word. Borrowings of this kind are not unheard of.

One of the other places for “latching” is the point in an isnād where “looseness” (*īrsāl*) or “interruption” (*inqīṭā*) occurs. “Latching” the point of looseness and interruption is customary for scholars. That is similar to what was mentioned above about “latching” a defective reading.

In some old ḥadīth manuscripts in isnāds containing a number of transmitters whose names are placed in conjunction with one another, one finds a symbol similar to the *qabba* between the names. Someone with little experience may mistakenly believe that it is a *qabba* when it is not. It seems that it is the symbol of connection between them which was written to confirm their conjunction for fear that “*an*” (from) would be put in the place of “*wāw*” (and). (Knowledge belongs to God. He is exalted). Some copyists occasionally abbreviate the symbol “It is correct” so that its shape comes to resemble that of the “*qabba*.” Perspicacity is one of the best things that can be bestowed on a person. God knows best.

13. When something that does not belong occurs in a book, it is eliminated by striking out (*darb*), scratching out (*hakk*), erasure<sup>38</sup> or some other way. Striking out is superior to scratching out and erasing. We heard that the judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād (God bless him) said, “Our colleagues say, ‘Scratching out is an accusation.’”<sup>39</sup> Someone informed me that al-Qāḍī Ḥyād said, “I heard our teacher Abū Baṛ Sufyān b. al-Āṣī al-Asādī<sup>40</sup> relating that one of his teachers used to say, ‘The teachers of old used to disapprove of bringing a knife to a ḥadīth class, in order that nothing be peeled away, because sometimes something that is peeled away in one class is established as sound in another transmission. The book may be heard another time from a different teacher with what was peeled off or scratched away from the transmission of the first teacher being correct in the transmission of the other. So then the student needs to restore it after it was peeled off. When a line is drawn over the reading on account of the transmission of the first teacher and it is established as being correct by the second teacher, the symbol standing for the second teacher above it is enough to establish its correctness.’”<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Sakhwī defines “*mahw*” as “the removal of words without scraping, where that is possible because the writing is on a tablet or on parchment or freshly written on very polished paper.”

This he explains is done with one’s fingers or a rag; *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:180.

<sup>39</sup> *Muḥaddith al-faṣil*, 606.

<sup>40</sup> Abū Baṛ b. al-Āṣī was an Andalusian grammarian who died in 520/1126 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 19:515–16.

<sup>41</sup> *Ilmāt*, 170.

There is disagreement over the best method of striking out. We heard that Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād said, “The best striking out does not obliterate the word being struck out. Rather writing a good clear line above the word indicates that it is invalid and the word can still be read under the line.”<sup>42</sup> We heard from al-Qādī Qiyād something to the effect that the preferences of precise writers differ regarding striking out.<sup>43</sup> Most of them favor extending a line over the portion of the text to be struck out, through the struck-out words. That is also called “splitting” (*shaqq*). Others do not draw the line through the portion of text, but rather fix it above it. However, they curve the ends of the line over the beginning and the end of the passage to be struck out. Some others regard that as a disfigurement and view it as marking up and defacing the page. Instead, they enclose the beginning of the passage to be struck out with half a circle and do the same at the end. When the passage to be struck out is long, sometimes they do that at the beginning and the end of each line of the passage. However, sometimes it suffices entirely to enclose the beginning of the passage and its end. There are some teachers who regard both striking out and bracketing the passage with half circles as disfiguring. They are content with a small circle at the beginning and the end of the superfluous passage. They call the small circle a “zero” (*sifr*), as the arithmeticians do.<sup>44</sup> Occasionally some scholars wrote “no” (*lā*) at the beginning of the passage to be deleted and “until” (*ilā*) at the end of it. Something like this works well for what is established in one relation and omitted in another. God knows best.

The striking out of unintentionally repeated words: the judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād al-Rāmahurmūzī (God bless him for his precedence) has anticipated us in the discussion of this. We heard that he said, “Some of our colleagues stated, ‘Of the two occurrences of the word, the one more deserving of being invalidated is the second, because the first was properly written and the second was written by mistake. So the mistake is more deserving of invalidation.’ Others said, ‘The book is a symbol of what is to be read. The occurrence of the word more clearly indicative of what is to be read and the finer of them in terms of shape is more deserving of preservation.’”<sup>45</sup> Finally, al-Qādī Qiyād came and made an excellent distinction. He opined that, if the repetition of the word is found at the beginning of a line, let the second occurrence be struck out, to protect the beginning of the line from markings and defacement. If the repetition is found at the end of a line, the first occurrence should be struck out, to protect the end of the line. Keeping the beginnings and the ends of the lines free from that is

<sup>42</sup> *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 606.

<sup>43</sup> *Ilmāt*, 171.

<sup>44</sup> For writing the zero in Arabic as a circle instead of the more usual dot, see Franz Rosenthal, *The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship* (Rome, 1947), 16, n. 1. This fundamental study contains a translation (pp. 8–18) of the chapter concerning books and writing from Almawī’s *al-Muṣid fi adab al-muṣid wa-l-muṣafid*, which amplifies many of the points discussed in this Category.

<sup>45</sup> *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 607.

best. If one occurrence of the repeated word comes at the end of a line and the other at the beginning of the next line, let the one at the end of the line be struck out, because it is more important to respect the beginning of a line. If the repetition occurs in the second or first term of a genitive construction, or in an adjective or the word it modifies, or something similar, we no longer take into account the beginning or the end of the line, but rather we respect the continuity between the two terms of the genitive construction, and so forth, in drawing the line. So, we do not separate them with the striking out and we strike out the outer word of the repetition, rather than the inner one.

Erasing is like scraping<sup>46</sup> in regard to the treatment that was discussed above.<sup>47</sup> There are various ways to do it. One of the strangest – although it is the safest – is what is related from Sahnūn b. Sa‘id al-Tanūkhi<sup>48</sup> – the Mālikī authority – to the effect that he sometimes wrote something and then licked it off. What we heard about Ibrāhīm al-Nakha‘ī (God be pleased with him) saying, “Ink on a man’s clothes and lips is a sign of good character,” also refers to that. God knows best.

14. For works containing differing transmissions of the same text, let the student undertake to record accurately the differences in his book and make a clear distinction between them, so that the transmissions do not become mixed up and confused and do not trip him up. The way to do this is for him to put down first the text of his book according to one particular transmission. Then, either in the margins or somewhere else, he attaches the additions from another relation, signals the omissions and records the differences. In each case he should designate everyone who related it, giving his full name. If he uses a symbol of one or more letters for the name, then he should, as was said above, explain what the symbol means at the beginning or end of his book, in case he forgets with the passage of time or his book comes into the possession of someone else who will fall into confusion and error because of his symbols. When there are many different relations, one is sometimes compelled to limit oneself to symbols.

For discriminating between different transmissions, some scholars felt it was enough to designate the supplementary relation with red ink. The Easterner Abū Dharr al-Harawī<sup>49</sup> and the Westerner Abu ’l-Hasan al-Qābī did that, as did many other early teachers and recorders of ḥadīth. When there is an addition

<sup>46</sup> *Kashṭ*, according to Sakhawī, is “scraping the paper with a knife or something similar;” *Fath al-Mughīth*, 2:180.

<sup>47</sup> This is somewhat oddly phrased since “scraping” has not been mentioned until now. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ may have regarded *kashṭ* as a synonym of *hakk*.

<sup>48</sup> The great North African scholar Abū Sa‘id ‘Abd al-Salām, nicknamed Sahnūn, (160/777–240/855) was the author of the influential legal guide *al-Mudawwana al-kubrā*; *EF*, 8:843–5; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:468–71.

<sup>49</sup> Abū Dharr ‘Abd b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Harawī (ca. 355/966–434/1043) was a Mālikite in law and a conservative Ash‘arīte in theology. He composed a number of works on ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:231.

in the supplementary relation of the text of the book, the student writes it in red. If there is an omission in the supplementary relation and the additional material is in the relation recorded in the main text of the book, he brackets that material in red. Whoever does this should make clear at the beginning or the end of the book to whom the relation marked with red belongs, as was stated above. God knows best.

15. For the most part, the writers of ḥadīth have come to confine themselves to using symbols for *ḥaddathanā* (He transmitted to us) and *akhbaranā* (He informed us). That has spread and taken over to the point where it is hardly ever confusing. For *ḥaddathanā* the last half is written; that is, *thā'*, *nūn*, *alif*, and sometimes only the pronoun is written; that is, *nūn* and *alif*. For *akhbaranā*, the aforementioned pronoun is written with an initial *alif*. It is not good the way certain scholars write *akhbaranā* with an *alif* in addition to the first symbol of *ḥaddathanā* we mentioned, even if Bayhāqī was one of those who did this.<sup>50</sup> Occasionally a *rā'* is written after the *alif* in the symbol for *akhbaranā* and a *dāl* at the beginning of the symbol for *ḥaddathanā*. The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim, Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Sulamī<sup>51</sup> and the expert Aḥmad al-Bayhāqī (God be pleased with them) are some of those in whose handwriting I have seen a *dāl* in the symbol for *ḥaddathanā*. God knows best.

When a ḥadīth has two or more isnāds, at the transition from one isnād to another some scholars write a symbol shaped like a *ḥā'*; that is, an unpointed, unconnected letter *ḥā'*. We have received no [convincing] explanation for this from any reliable person.

However, I have found in the handwriting of the professor and ḥadīth expert Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ṣābūnī,<sup>52</sup> the expert Abū Muslim ‘Umar b. ‘Alī al-Laythī al-Bukhārī<sup>53</sup> and the jurist and ḥadīth scholar Abū Sa‘d al-Khalilī<sup>54</sup> (God bless them) the word *sahha* (It is sound) unambiguously written in

<sup>50</sup> Written without pointing, the *thā'-nūn-alif* of *ḥaddathanā* is identical to the *bā'-nūn-alif* of this abbreviation of *akhbaranā*. Suyūṭī (*Tadrib al-rāwī*, 2:87) felt that *alif-bā'-nūn-alif* might be mistaken for the abbreviation of *ḥaddathanā* while Sakhāwī (*Faṣḥ al-Mughīth*, 2:190) suggested that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ feared that it might be read as *anbā'anā* or an abbreviation of it.

<sup>51</sup> Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sulamī (325/936 or 330–412/1021) was one of the greatest of the early Sufis and the author of a number of important works on topics related to mysticism, including the biographical dictionary *Tabaqāt al-Ṣūfīya* (ed. J. Pedersen, Leiden, 1960); *EP*, 9:811–12; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:671–74.

<sup>52</sup> Abū ‘Uthmān Ismā‘il b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Aḥmad al-Ṣābūnī (373/983–449/1057) was a scholar famed for his piety and knowledge; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:40–44.

<sup>53</sup> Abū Muslim ‘Umar b. ‘Alī al-Laythī al-Bukhārī (d. 466/1074 or 468) composed a work entitled *Musnad al-Saḥīḥayn*; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:407–9.

<sup>54</sup> This may be the Abū Sa‘d Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Khalil al-Khalilī (467/1075–548/1153) whom Abū Sa‘d al-Samā‘ī identifies as one of his teachers; *al-Ansāb*, 2:394–5; Ibn al-Athīr, *al-Lubāb fi tāhhib al-Ansāb*, 3 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 1:458.

place of the *ḥāḍī*, and this suggests that the *ḥāḍī* is an abbreviation of *sahha*. It is good to place *sahha* here so that no one mistakenly believes the ḥadīth that goes with the isnād has been omitted and to prevent the two isnāds from being combined into a single isnād. Someone whom I met on a journey in Khurāṣān related to me from an Isfahani whom he described as possessing merit that it is an unpointed letter *ḥāḍī* from the word *tahwil* (transition); that is, from one isnād to another. I once consulted a North African scholar about it. I related to him from a ḥadīth scholar I had met that the unpointed *ḥāḍī* represents the word *al-ḥadīth*. He said to me, “The people of North Africa – and I do not know of any disagreement among them – write it as an unpointed *ḥāḍī* and when one of them encounters it in reciting, he says, ‘*al-ḥadīth*.’” He told me that he had heard a Baghdadi also say that it is an unpointed *ḥāḍī* and that when some of them come across it in their recitation, they say, “*ḥāḍī*,” and continue. I asked the well-traveled expert Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ruhāwī<sup>55</sup> (God bless him) about it. He said that it is the *ḥāḍī* from *ḥāḍīl* (divider); that is, it separates two isnāds. He said, “Nothing is said when one comes across it in reciting.” He denied that it is from the word *al-ḥadīth* or the other words. He was not acquainted with anything else from any of his teachers and they included a number of the ḥadīth experts of his day. I think it best – and God is the one who grants success – that the reciter say, “*ḥāḍī*,” when he comes across it and continue. This is the most cautious way and the most equitable. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

16. The expert al-Khaṭīb stated “that after the phrase ‘In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful,’ the student should write the name (*ism*) of the teacher from whom he heard the book, his paidonymic (*kunya*) and lineage (*nasab*) and then put forth what he heard from him verbatim.” Al-Khaṭīb went on to add: “When he comes to write the book he heard, he should write over the words ‘In the name of God,’ and so forth, the names of those who heard the book with him and the date of the audition. If he likes, he may alternatively write that information in the margin of the first page of the book. Our teachers did it both ways.”<sup>56</sup> Writing the list of auditors (*tasmī’*) where he said is safest and most appropriate because it will not be hidden from those in need of it. There is also nothing wrong with writing it at the end of the book, on the outside of it or wherever it can be easily found. The list of auditors should be in the script of a trustworthy person whose handwriting is not unknown. There is no harm then in the teacher granting the audition not endorsing the list of auditors in his own

<sup>55</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Qādir b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ruhāwī (536/1142–612/1215) was one of the greatest ḥadīth transmitters in the region of the Jazīra during his lifetime; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 22:71–5.

<sup>56</sup> *Jāmi’*, 133.

hand.<sup>57</sup> Likewise, there is nothing wrong with the owner of the book, if he is trustworthy, merely recording his audition in his own hand. Reliable scholars have long done this.

The teacher Abu 'l-Muzzafar, the son of the expert Abū Sa'īd al-Marwāzī [al-Samāni] transmitted to me in Marv from his father from an inhabitant of Isfahan who transmitted to him that in Baghdad 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī 'Abd Allāh b. Manda<sup>58</sup> recited a ḥadīth monograph to Abū Aḥmad al-Faraḍī<sup>59</sup> and requested that he sign it as a guarantee for it. Abū Aḥmad said to him, "My son, you must be veracious. When you become known for that, no one will call you a liar and you will be regarded as truthful in what you say and transmit. When that is not the case, if they were to say to you, 'This is not the handwriting of Abū Aḥmad al-Faraḍī,' what would you say to them?"

The writer of the list of auditors must be attentive and careful. He should make clear in unambiguous terms the identity of the auditor, the material heard and the teacher from whom it was heard. He must avoid laxity in recording the names of the auditors and beware of leaving out the name of any of the auditors for an impure motive. There is nothing wrong if the writer of the list of auditors (*muthabbit al-samā'*) does not personally attend the entire audition, but draws it up relying on information from someone who was present and whose word he can trust (God – He is exalted – willing).

It is shameful for the owner of a book to conceal it from someone whose name is inscribed in the list of auditors and to prevent him from transferring the record of his audition (*naql samā'ihi*) and copying the book.

When the owner does lend it to him, the borrower should not be slow in returning it. We heard that Zuhrī said, "Beware of the *ghulūl* of books!" Someone asked him, "What is 'the *ghulūl* of books'?" He said, "Withholding them from their owners." We heard that al-Fuḍayl b. 'Iyād<sup>60</sup> (God be pleased with him) said, "It is not the act of a pious man nor that

57 The transmitter would customarily endorse the certificate of audition by personally writing *hadhā saḥīḥ* or something to that effect and signing his name; see Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid, "*Ijāzāt al-samā'* fi 'l-makḥṭūyat al-qadima," *Revue de l'Institut des Manuscrits Arabes*, 1 (1375/1955):235–6. This article is a great aid in understanding the issues raised in this section, although it should be noted that its title is somewhat misleading for the document al-Munajjid terms *ijāzat al-samā'* is more properly called *samā'*, *tasmī'* or *tabaqā*.

58 Abu 'l-Qasim 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad b. Manda (381/991–470/1078), the brother of Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Abd Allāh, was a controversial expert in ḥadīth and the author of a number of books; *EP*, 3:863–4.

59 Abū Aḥmad 'Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Faraḍī al-Muqrī was a ḥadīth transmitter who died in 406/1016 at more than eighty years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:212–14.

60 Abū 'Ali al-Fuḍayl b. 'Iyād al-Tamīmī (105/723–187/802) was born in Samarcand, studied in al-Kūfa and died while resident in Mecca. Although a respected transmitter of ḥadīth, he is best remembered for his great piety; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:636.

of a wise man to take the record of audition of a man and withhold it from him. Whoever does this harms himself” – or according to another relation: “It is not the act of a scholar to take the record of audition and book of a man and withhold it from him.”

What if he does happen to forbid this to him? We heard that a man in al-Kūfa laid a claim against another man for a record of audition which he withheld from him. They took their dispute to the judge there, Ḥafṣ b. Ghīyāth.<sup>61</sup> He said to the owner of the book, “Bring us your books. We impose on you the books with the record of audition of this man recorded in your hand. We exempt you from the books with the record of audition of this man recorded in his hand.” Ibn Khallād said, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī about this and he said, ‘There is no ruling better than this on that issue, because the handwriting of the owner of the book indicates that he consented to his colleague listening with him.’ Someone else said, ‘It is worthless.’”<sup>62</sup> The expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb related that the judge Ismā‘il b. Ishaq<sup>63</sup> was consulted about this and he lowered his head in thought for a long time and then said to the defendant, “If the record of his audition is recorded in your book in your handwriting, you are obliged to lend it to him. If his record of audition in your book is recorded in the hand of someone else, then you know best.”<sup>64</sup>

Ḥafṣ b. Ghīyāth is counted among the first generation of the followers of Abū Ḥanīfa. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayrī was one of the authorities of the Shāfi‘ites. Ismā‘il b. Ishaq is the spokesman of the Mālikites and their authority. Their statements back one another up in that matter and the upshot of them is that the owner of a book which contains with his acknowledgement the audition of someone else is compelled to lend the book to that person. Originally, the reason for this was not evident to me. Then I reasoned that the owner’s recording the man’s name in the book is equivalent to having testimony in his favor in his possession, so he has to produce it on the basis of the substance of the testimony, even if it involves expending his own property. Similarly, the bearer of testimony in court is compelled to produce it, even if he has to put himself out by running to the court to do so. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

When the student copies a book, he should transfer the record of his audition to his copy only after a satisfactory collation. Likewise, one should not transfer a

<sup>61</sup> Abu ‘Umar Ḥafṣ b. Ghīyāth al-Nakha‘ī al-Tamīmī (117/735–194/810) served as judge in Baghdad and al-Kūfa; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:22–34.

<sup>62</sup> *Muḥaddith al-faṣīl*, 589.

<sup>63</sup> Abu Ishaq Ismā‘il b. Ishaq al-Azdi (199/815–282/895) was born in al-Baṣra and served as a judge in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:475–6.

<sup>64</sup> *Jāmi‘*, 117.

list of auditors to any copy of a book until the book is collated in a satisfactory manner with the copy which was actually heard nor record the list of auditors in the copy automatically at the time of the audition. That way no one will be misled by the uncollated copy. This holds unless it is made clear that the copy is uncollated during the transfer of the record of audition and upon the inscribing it.<sup>65</sup> God knows best.

---

65 See Ḥarāqī, *Tabṣīra*, 2:161.

## Category 26

### ON THE MANNER OF RELATING HADITH AND THE STIPULATIONS REGARDING THE CONVEYANCE OF THEM, AND RELATED MATTERS

(*Fī ṣifat riwāyat al-ḥadīth wa-shart adā'ihi wa-mā yata'allaqu bi-dhālika*)

Many of the matters relevant to this topic have already been discussed in the previous two Categories. Some people are excessively strict in relating hadith and others are excessively lax. One example of strictness is the doctrine of those who say, "A hadith may not be cited as a proof unless the transmitter relates from his memory and recollection." That is related from Mālik and Abū Hanifa (God be pleased with them). Abū Bakr al-Ṣaydalānī al-Marwāzī<sup>1</sup> was a Shāfi'iite who subscribed to this view. Another excessively strict doctrine is that of those who permit a scholar to rely on his book when transmitting, but would not view the relation from it as valid, if he had lent it out or let it out of his possession, on account of its absence from him.<sup>2</sup>

We have already related the views of those who tolerate laxity and the refutation of them in the course of the preceding explication of the means of receiving and taking up hadith. One group of lax transmitters are those who hear certain compositions and are remiss to the extent that, when they grow old and come to be needed, ignorance and greed lead them to relate the texts from purchased or borrowed copies which are unsound and have not been collated. The expert Abū 'Abd Allah al-Hākim included those people in the ranks of discredited transmitters. He said, "They mistakenly believe that they are truthful in their relation. This happens often among people. Certain leading scholars and people known for their piety practice it."<sup>3</sup>

'Abd Allāh b. Lāhi'a al-Miṣrī<sup>4</sup> was a lax transmitter. Despite his augustness, citing his relations as proofs was rejected on account of his laxity. It was said that Yaḥyā b. Ḥassān<sup>5</sup> saw a group of people who had a personal

1 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Dāwūd al-Ṣaydalānī al-Dāwūdī (fl. sixth/twelfth century) was known exclusively for his commentary on Muzāni's *Mukhtaṣar*; *Subki, Tabaqāt*, 4:148–9.

2 The fear was that, while the book was out of the transmitter's possession, it would be surreptitiously altered and he would not be able to detect the changes since he had not memorized the text; *al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Kifāya*, 227; *al-Qādī Iyād, Ilmā'*, 136.

3 *Madkhal*, 40 (Arabic), 39–40 (English).

4 Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān 'Abd Allāh b. Lāhi'a al-Miṣrī (97/715–174/790) served as a judge in Egypt and was a prolific transmitter, although, as the passage indicates, his reliability was questioned; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:94.

5 Abū Zakariyā' Yaḥyā b. Ḥassān al-Baṣrī (144/761–208/823) was a student of a number of popular transmitters and died in Egypt; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:127–30.

collection of ḥadīth (*juz'*) which they heard from Ibn Lāhi'a. He examined the text and not a single ḥadīth in it belonged to Ibn Lāhi'a. He went to Ibn Lāhi'a and told him that. He said, "What can I do? They bring a book and say, 'This contains your hadīth,' so I transmit it to them." Something similar occurs among the teachers of our day. A student brings a personal collection or a book to a teacher and says, "This is your relation." Then the teacher lets him recite it to him, trusting him blindly, without undertaking any investigation to ascertain the truth of the ascription.

The correct view is the one the majority adhere to and it is the middle path between excessive strictness and excessive negligence. When a transmitter meets the stipulations which were explicated above for receiving and taking up ḥadīth and he collates his book and fixes his audition in the fashion described above, it is permissible for him to transmit from it. This holds even if he had lent his book to someone and it was out of his possession, when it is probable that the book is free from alteration and changes. In particular, this is true when the transmitter is one of those who for the most part would recognize whether the text had been altered or changed. That is because in the field of the relation of ḥadīth, we depend on likelihood. When this obtains, it is enough and nothing more than this is stipulated. God knows best.

### *Some Subsidiary Issues*

- When the transmitter is blind and did not memorize his ḥadīth from the mouth of the teacher who transmitted to him, but instead sought the aid of some trustworthy people to make precise his audition and commit the book to memory and in transmitting the text asked for their help in the recitation of the book to him: his relation is sound when he takes care in that regard to the best of his ability, so that the likelihood is that there is no alteration. However, he is more liable to be challenged or forbidden from something like this than a person who can see. However, the expert al-Khaṭīb said, "Audition from a sighted, illiterate person who did not memorize from the transmitter the ḥadīth he heard from him – rather it was written down for him – is the same as audition from a blind person who did not memorize his ḥadīth from the transmitter. Some scholars have forbidden it and some have permitted it."<sup>6</sup> God knows best.
- When a student hears a book and then wants to relate it from a copy of the text which does not contain a record of his audition and was not collated with the copy he heard, although his teacher gave audition from this copy to others: it is not licit for him to relate from that copy. The authority and jurist Abū Naṣr b. al-Šabbāgh stated this unequivocally in something of his we read. In the same way, if the copy contained the record of his teacher's audition or a reliable person

---

<sup>6</sup> *Kifāya*, 338.

related from it from his teacher, it would still not be permissible for the student to relate from it, relying merely on that, since he would not be certain that it did not contain additions not present in the copy which he heard. I found that al-Khaṭīb has related corroboration of this from most of the scholars of ḥadīth. He stated that when the student finds the text of the transmitter and the student's audition is not recorded in it or he finds a copy written from his teacher the authenticity of which he has no qualms about, the generality of the scholars of ḥadīth forbid him to transmit from it. On the other hand, it is said that Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī and Muḥammad b. Bakr al-Bursānī<sup>7</sup> allowed it.<sup>8</sup>

That holds true unless the student has a global license (*ijāza ... āmma*) or something similar from his teacher for the material he relates. In this case it is permissible for him to relate from that copy, since it is nothing more than the relation of those additions [which may be found in the copy of the text the student wants to use] under the term "He informed us" or "He transmitted to me" by virtue of the license without an explanation that the additions are transmitted by license. That is a minor matter, the like of which may be tolerated. Indeed, we related above that licensing is necessary for every audition so that the words and passages which were omitted due to inattention or for some other reason may be transmitted by virtue of the license, even if they were not actually spoken.<sup>9</sup>

If the copy of the text [which the student wants to use] instead contains the record of the audition of his teacher's teacher – or it was heard from the teacher of his teacher or related from the teacher of his teacher: in that case to relate from it the student should have a comprehensive license (*ijāza shāmila*) from his teacher and his teacher should have a comprehensive license from his teacher. This is a good facilitation which God – and praise belongs to Him – led us to and the need for it is very pressing in our time. God knows best.

3. When someone who has memorized a text finds in his book something in conflict with what he memorized, the matter is examined. If he memorized the text from that book, let him go back to what is in his book. If he memorized it from the mouth of the transmitter, let him rely on his memory rather than on what is in his book, when he has no doubts about his recollection of it. It is a good idea for him to mention the two versions in his relation, saying, "My recollection is such and such and in my book it is such and such." That is what Shu'ba and others did. Likewise, when another person who memorized the text contradicts him regarding what he memorized, let him say, "My recollection is such and such and X said for it such and such," or "someone else said such and such for it," or some other phrase like that. That is what Sufyān al-Thawrī and others did. God knows best.

<sup>7</sup> Abu 'Abd Allah (or Abu 'Uthmān) Muḥammad b. Bakr al-Bursānī died in al-Baṣra in 203/819; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:421–2.

<sup>8</sup> *Kifāya*, 257.

<sup>9</sup> See above, p. 106.

4. When a transmitter finds a record of his audition in his book and he does not remember having heard it: it is reported that Abū Ḥanifa (God bless him) and some of the followers of Shāfi‘ī (God bless him) did not permit the transmitter to relate the book. The doctrine of Shāfi‘ī and most of his followers, Abū Yūsuf<sup>10</sup> and Muḥammad<sup>11</sup> is that he is permitted to transmit it. This disagreement ought to be addressed in the light of the disagreement just treated above over the permissibility of the transmitter relying on his book to retain (*dabī*) what he heard. Retaining the text used in the audition is like retaining the material actually heard. The correct view and that of the majority of the scholars of ḥadīth is to permit reliance on a well-guarded book to retain the material heard. Thus, the transmitter is permitted to relate the contents, even if he does not recall each and every ḥadīth in it. So let that be true, if the following condition is met: the record of audition must be in his handwriting or in the handwriting of someone he has confidence in and the book must be well guarded to the extent that it is likely to be free from the touch of forgery and alteration, in the fashion previously described for that. This applies when he has no doubts about it<sup>12</sup> and has no qualms regarding its correctness. If he does have doubts about it, reliance on the book is not permitted. God knows best.

5. When the student wants to relate what he has heard in paraphrase rather than verbatim: if he is not a scholar who is knowledgeable in words and what they mean, familiar with what changes their sense and in possession of insight into the shades of difference between them, there is no disagreement that he is not permitted to do that. He should relate what he heard only in the same terms in which he heard it, without any alteration. The permissibility of this, if he is a scholar who is knowledgeable in these matters, is one of the things the pious forebears, the scholars of ḥadīth, and the greatest authorities in practical and theoretical law have disagreed about. Some of the transmitters of ḥadīth, certain Shāfi‘īte experts in positive and theoretical law and others permitted it. Some of them forbade it for the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and allowed it for other material. The most correct view is to permit it for everything, if the transmitter knows what we described and states plainly that he is passing on the sense of the words which reached him, because that is what the affairs of the Companions and early forebears testify to. They often used to transmit a single

<sup>10</sup> Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī (113/731–182/798) was one of the most prominent students of the *imām* Abū Ḥanifa and he served as the chief judge in Baghdad; *EP*, 1:164–5; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:419–21.

<sup>11</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Shaybānī (132/750–189/805) was, like Abū Yūsuf, one of the most prominent early Hanafites. His writings form the foundation of Hanafite law; *EP*, 9:392–4; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:421–33.

<sup>12</sup> Sirāj al-Dīn al-Bulqī writes that the antecedent of this pronoun may be either “the record of the audition” (*samā’*) or “the touch of forgery and alteration” (*tajarruq al-tazwīr wa-’l-taghyīr ilayhi*); *Mahāsin al-iṣfiliḥ wa-taqṣīm Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*, ed. ʻA’ishah ‘Abd al-Rahmān with *Muqaddima*, 2nd edn (Cairo, 1989), 394.

notion about a particular matter with different words and that was only because they relied on the sense rather than the wording.

We do not think that this disagreement is active any more and people do not practice transmission by paraphrase, so far as we know, with the contents of books. No one has the right to alter the wording of anything in an authored book and replace it with another word having the same meaning. Rather, those who permitted transmission by paraphrasing did so on account of the difficulty and hardship faced by the Companions and early forebears in rendering the words exactly and rigidly sticking to them. That problem does not exist for the contents of papers and books, because even if someone does possess the authority to change a spoken word, he does not possess the authority to change the composition of someone else. God knows best.

6. Someone who paraphrases a ḥadīth should say after it, “or however he put it” (*aw kamā qāla*), “or something like that” (*aw naḥwu hādhā*), and similar expressions. That practice was related from the Companions Ibn Mas‘ūd, Abu ‘l-Dardā<sup>13</sup> and Anas (God be pleased with them). Al-Khaṭīb said, “The Companions were masters of the language and were the people most knowledgeable in semantics. They used these expressions only out of fear of error on account of their recognition of the danger inherent in transmission by paraphrasing.”<sup>14</sup>

Whenever someone reciting a text comes across something that seems obscure to him, he should read the dubious form and then say, “or however he put it.” This is a good idea and it is the correct course in a matter like this, because the transmitter’s licensing the student and permitting him to relate the correct form from him, when it becomes evident, are inherent in his saying, “or however he put it.” It is not necessary for the transmitter to pronounce the license specifically for the doubtful reading, for the reason we just explained. God knows best.

7. Is it permissible to abridge a ḥadīth and transmit only part of it? Scholars disagree about that. Some forbid it outright on the basis of the doctrine of absolutely forbidding transmission by paraphrasing. Some forbid it despite allowing transmission by paraphrasing, when the transmitter has not related the ḥadīth in its complete form at some other time and it is not known that someone else related it in its complete form. Some permit it without any restrictions and make no distinctions. Indeed, we heard that Mujaḥid said, “Leave out whatever you want from a ḥadīth but never add anything to it.” The correct approach is to make a distinction. Abridging is permissible for a knowledgeable and informed transmitter when what he omits can be separated from what he transmits and is not dependent on it, so that the meaning does not become defective and the legal point of what he transmits is not altered by the omission. This should be permitted,

<sup>13</sup> Abu ‘l-Dardā’ al-Anṣārī al-Khaṣrajī (the rest of his name is disputed) was an important Companion of the Prophet who died in Damascus around 32/653; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:335–53.

<sup>14</sup> *Jāmi‘*, 251.

even if transmission by paraphrasing is not permitted, because under these circumstances the part he omits [and the part which he relates] are tantamount to two separate reports on two matters, neither dependant on the other.

This applies if the transmitter's stature is so elevated that an accusation will not be lodged against him for transmitting it first completely and then in a shortened form or for transmitting it first in shortened form and then completely. If his stature is not so elevated, the expert al-Khaṭīb has said that whoever relates a ḥadīth in its complete form and is afraid that if he relates it another time with an omission he will be accused of having the first time added something he had not heard or of having the second time forgotten the rest of the hadīth on account of his lack of precision and his propensity to err, must banish this suspicion from himself.<sup>15</sup> The authoritative jurist Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Sulaym b. Ayyūb al-Rāzī said that this constitutes an excuse to omit and conceal the addition for whoever relates part of a report and then wants to relate it completely, if he is one of those who will be accused of having added something to his ḥadīth. In my opinion, someone like this should not, from the start, relate ḥadīth incompletely, if he has been enjoined to give it completely. This is because if he initially relates it incompletely, he excludes the rest of it from being cited as a proof. He ends up oscillating between not relating it at all, thereby forfeiting it entirely, and relating it and being accused [of putting a false addition in it] for doing so, thereby wasting any benefit from it because of the destruction of its value as a proof. Knowledge belongs to God (He is exalted).

If an author breaks up the text of a single ḥadīth and distributes its parts under various legal topics in his book, it is closer to being permitted and further from being forbidden. Indeed, Mālik, Bukhārī and more than one of the other authorities in ḥadīth did that, although it is not completely unreprehensible. God knows best.

8. A transmitter should not relate his ḥadīth through the recitation of someone prone to grammatical mistakes and misreading. We heard that al-Naḍr b. Shumayl<sup>16</sup> (God be pleased with him) said, "Originally these ḥadīth came in good Arabic." Abū Bakr [or Abu 'l-Faṭḥ or Abu 'l-Qāsim] b. Abi 'l-Ma'āli al-Furāwī informed us by recitation to him. He said, My great-grandfather, the authority Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl al-Furāwī<sup>17</sup> informed us. He said, Abu 'l-Husayn 'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Muḥammad b. al-Fārisī<sup>18</sup> informed us. He said, The authority

15 *Kifāya*, 193.

16 Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Naḍr b. Shumayl al-Mazīnī was born in Marv around 122/740. As a boy, he traveled to al-Baṣra with his father and studied under the great grammarian Khalīl b. Aḥmad. He later returned to Marv, where he served as judge. He died there either on the last day of the year 203/819 or near the beginning of 204; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:59.

17 Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl al-Furāwī (ca. 441/1049–530/1136) was a famous transmitter of several major ḥadīth collections; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:615–19.

18 Abu 'l-Husayn 'Abd al-Ghāfir b. Muḥammad b. al-Fārisī (ca. 350/961–448/1056) was one of the great ḥadīth transmitters of his generation; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 18:19–21.

Abū Sulaymān Ḥam̄d b. Muḥammad al-Khaṭābī informed us. He said, Muḥammad b. Mu‘ādh<sup>19</sup> transmitted to me. He said, One of our teachers informed us from Abū Dāwūd al-Sinjī.<sup>20</sup> He said, I heard Aṣma‘ī<sup>21</sup> saying, “The greatest fear I have for a student of ḥadīth – if he does not know grammar – is that he fall under the general designation of the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), ‘Whoever ascribes a lie to me, let him take his seat in Hell,’ because the Prophet (Peace be upon him) did not make grammatical mistakes. Whenever you relate a ḥadīth from him and make a grammatical mistake in it, you ascribe a lie to him.”

The student of ḥadīth has a duty to learn enough grammar and lexicography to avoid the shame and ignominy of grammatical mistakes and miswriting. We heard that Shu‘ba said, “Whoever studies ḥadīth and does not comprehend the Arabic language is like someone who wears a burnous without a hood,” or however he put it. We heard that Ḥammād b. Salama said, “Someone who studies ḥadīth and does not know grammar is like a donkey wearing a nosebag with no barley in it.” The way to avoid misreading is to take ḥadīth from the mouth of people possessing knowledge and accuracy. Whoever is deprived of that and instead takes and learns his ḥadīth from books is likely to corrupt the ḥadīth and is unable to keep from changing and misreading the text. God knows best.

9. When a grammatical mistake or an instance of misreading occurs during the relation of a ḥadīth: there is a disagreement over what to do. Some people used to hold the opinion that the student should relate it with the mistake, just as he heard it. The Followers Muḥammad b. Sirīn and Abū Ma‘mar ‘Abd Allāh b. Sakhbarā<sup>22</sup> subscribed to that. This is an extreme manifestation of the doctrine of adhering to the exact wording of the recitation and forbidding transmission by paraphrasing. Others recommend altering and correcting the mistake and relating it in its correct form. We heard that view from Awzā‘ī, Ibn al-Mubārak and others, and it is the doctrine of beginning and advanced scholars of ḥadīth. Advocating this for a grammatical mistake which does not change the sense of the ḥadīth and similar cases is a necessity according to the doctrine which permits the transmission of ḥadīth by paraphrase, and, as just stated, this is the doctrine of the majority.

The right way to correct and change a mistake found in both a book and the original it was copied from is to leave it and report what occurs in the original as

<sup>19</sup> Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Mu‘ādh al-Harawī was a student of Abū Dāwūd al-Sinjī. He died in 316/928 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:484–5.

<sup>20</sup> Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. Ma‘bad al-Sinjī (d. 257/871) is described as a litterateur and poet; Ibn al-Athīr, *Lubāb*, 2:147.

<sup>21</sup> Abū Sa‘d ‘Abd al-Malik b. Qurayb al-Aṣma‘ī (ca. 120/738–213/828) was a renowned philologist who served at the court of the caliph Hārūn al-Rashid; *EF*, 1:717–19. Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:71–6; 9:66–7.

<sup>22</sup> Abū Ma‘mar ‘Abd Allāh b. Sakhbarā al-Azdī was a Kūfān transmitter of ḥadīth who was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died during the governorship of ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Ziyād; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:133–4.

it is while placing a “latch” (*dabba*)<sup>23</sup> on it and indicating the correct form on the margin of the page. That is the most useful and least damaging way.

We heard that one scholar of ḥadīth was seen in a dream. Something passed from his lips – or from his tongue. He was asked about this and said, “It is a word from a ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him and his family) which I changed on my own volition, so this was done to me.”

Often we see that something which many scholars mistakenly believe to be an error – and they often change it – is correct with sound justification, even if it is obscure and may be considered peculiar. This occurs in particular in what they consider an error from the standpoint of good Arabic. That is because of the numerousness of the dialects and the sub-dialects of the Arabs.<sup>24</sup> We heard that ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal<sup>25</sup> said, “When my father came across a grievous error, he corrected it. When it was a minor mistake, he left it and said, ‘So said the teacher.’” One of our teachers informed me of something to the same effect from someone who informed him from the expert al-Qādī Ḥiyād.<sup>26</sup> In a word, the practice to which most of the teachers of old adhered was to transmit the relation as it reached them, without changing it in their books.

Even the variant readings of the Qur’ān continue to be transmitted in books – without being considered anomalous – in conflict with the universally accepted recitation. Some of that also occurs in the two *Sahīhs*, the *Muwaṭṭa'* and other works.

However, the more knowledgeable teachers point out these errors in these books when the text is heard and recited and in the margins of the books while still reporting what is in the texts in the way it reached them.

Some, including Abu ’l-Walīd Hishām b. Aḥmad al-Kinānī al-Waqqashi,<sup>27</sup> had the audacity to alter books and correct them. Because of his wide reading, his mastery of several disciplines, his penetrating intellect and his keen intelligence, he ventured to make many corrections and he did make mistakes in some instances. The same is true of others who did the same thing.

The best way is to forbid all alteration and correction so that someone who is not competent will not venture to do it. The first way [that is, reproducing the text as found] accompanied by a clarification is the safest. So at the audition, the

23 See below, pp. 138–9.

24 The Prophet addressed the various Arab tribes in their own dialect; al-Qādī Ḥiyād, *Ilmā'*, 183.

25 ‘Abd Allah (213/828–290/903), unlike his older brother Ṣalīḥ, remained in Baghdad with their father, the *imām* Aḥmad; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:516–26.

26 *Ilmā'*, 185–6.

27 Abu ’l-Walīd Hishām b. Aḥmad al-Kinānī al-Waqqashi (408/1017–489/1096) was an Andalusian scholar praised for his expertise in a number of disciplines; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:134–6.

transmitter should give the mistake as it occurs and then state the form which is correct, either with regard to sound Arabic usage or with regard to transmission. If he wants, he may recite it first in its correct form and then say, “Such and such is the way it is found with our teacher” – or “in our relation,” or “by way of X.” In fact this is better than the first way, since the transmitter does not ascribe to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) something he did not say.

The most appropriate procedure to rely on when making a correction is to mend the false form with something found in other ḥadīth. Whoever does this is safe from ascribing to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) something which he did not say. God knows best.

10. When the correction consists of adding something that was omitted: if the addition is such that it does not change the sense, then it is treated in the fashion described above. That is similar to what is related from Mālik (God be pleased with him). He was asked, “Do you view as valid a ḥadīth of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) to which the letters *wāw* and *alif* were added, while the meaning remains the same?” He said, “I hope that it will be considered insignificant.”

If the correction by the addition entails a meaning different from what occurs in the text, the well-established verdict is for the transmitter to mention the wording as it appears in the text coupled with a notification of what was omitted. This way he will be safe both from the shame of the error [that is, the omission] and from ascribing to his teacher something he did not say. Abū Nu‘aym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn transmitted a ḥadīth from a teacher of his in which he said, “From Buḥayna.” Then Abū Nu‘aym said, “He really is *Ibn Buḥayna*,” but my teacher said, “Buḥayna.” When someone below the occurrence of the omitted material is known to have provided the material and someone else later on omitted it, it is treated differently. The student should supply the omission in its correct place in the book with the phrase “that is” (*ya‘ni*). This is what the expert al-Khaṭīb did<sup>28</sup> when he related from Abū ‘Umar b. Māhdi<sup>29</sup> from al-Qādī al-Mahāmili,<sup>30</sup> with his isnād, from ‘Urwa from ‘Amra bint ‘Abd al-Rahmān<sup>31</sup> – *that is* from ‘Ā’isha – that she said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to put his head near to me so that I could comb it.” Al-Khaṭīb said, “The text of Ibn Mahdi read ‘from ‘Amra that she said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) used to put his head near to me ...’” So we added to it the mention of

28 *Kiṣāya*, 253.

29 Abū ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Wāḥid b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mahdī (318/930–410/1019) was best known for being the principal transmitter of the ḥadīth of al-Qādī al-Mahāmili; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:221–2.

30 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Ismā‘il al-Ḍabbi (235/849–330/941) served as a judge in al-Kūfa for sixty years and held a salon for scholars of law and ḥadīth in his house; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:180–1.

31 ‘Amra bint ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Anṣāriya (d. ca. 100/719) was a student of ‘Ā’isha and an authority on law in her own right; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:507–8.

‘Ā’isha since it was indispensable and we knew that Maḥāmili related it that way. However, the mention of ‘Ā’isha was omitted in the book of our teacher Abū ‘Umar [b. Mahdī]. We said, ‘That is from ‘Ā’isha,’ in the isnād because Ibn Mahdī did not say that to us. I have seen a number of our teachers doing the same thing in similar cases.” Then he mentioned, with his isnād, that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “I heard Waki‘ saying, ‘In ḥadīth I call upon “that is” for help.’”

This is true when his teacher has related it to him incorrectly. When it is the case that the omission is found in the student’s book and it seems likely to him that the omission occurs only in the book and is not from his teacher, then correcting it both in his book and in his relation when he transmits it is justified. Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijistānī] said that he told Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, “I found in my book, ‘Hajjāj [b. Muḥammad al-A‘war] from Jurayj from Abu ‘l-Zubayr [Muhammad b. Muslim b. Tadrūs].’ Is it permissible for me to correct it to ‘Ibn Jurayj?’” He said, “I hope that there is nothing wrong with doing that.” God knows best.

This is similar to the case when part of an isnād or text is effaced in the student’s book. It is permissible for him to supply the missing text from someone else’s book, when he knows that it is correct and he has no doubts that it actually is what is missing from his book. However, there are some transmitters who do not view this as permissible. One of those who did replace missing text this way was Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād,<sup>32</sup> according to what Yaḥyā b. Ma‘in related from him. The expert al-Khaṭīb said, “It would have been better, if he had made that clear at the time of the relation.”<sup>33</sup> The same verdict applies to the transmitter who relies on his memory who seeks to verify something he has doubts about in someone else’s book or his own recollection. It is related that a number of the scholars of ḥadīth did that, including ‘Āsim,<sup>34</sup> Abū ‘Awāna [al-Isfarāyīnī] and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. Some of them used to note the material someone else verified, saying, “X transmitted the ḥadīth to us and Y verified it for me.” For example, it is related that Yazid b. Ḥarūn said, “‘Āsim informed us – and Shu‘ba verified it for me – from ‘Abd Allah b. Sarjis.”<sup>35</sup> This is also required when the transmitter finds in the original of his book a rare Arabic word or something incompletely written which puzzles him. It is licit for the student to ask well-informed scholars about it and relate it in accordance with what they tell him. Something similar to this was related from Ishāq b. Rāhawayh, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and others (God be pleased with them). God knows best.

32 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nu‘aym b. Ḥammād al-Khuza‘ī (d. ca. 228/844) was a scholar of ḥadīth and opponent of the Ḥanafites who is best known for his book *Kitāb al-Fitan*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:104–5.

33 *Kifāya*, 254.

34 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Āsim b. Sulaymān al-Tamīmī al-Baṣrī, known as ‘Āsim al-Āḥwal, was a transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 140/757; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:13–15.

35 According to some standards, ‘Abd Allāh b. Sarjis qualified as a Companion of the Prophet. He died in al-Baṣra after 80/699; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:426–7.

11. When the transmitter has a ḥadīth from two or more teachers and there is a difference in the wording between their relations, but the meaning is the same: he may join them together in a single isnād and then quote the ḥadīth according to the particular wording of one of them and say, “X and Y informed us and the wording is that of X,” – or “this is the wording of X” – “he” – or “they” – “said, ‘Z informed us,’” or other similar expressions. Muslim – the author of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* – also has another good expression for this. He says for instance, “Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba<sup>36</sup> and Abū Sa‘īd al-Ashajj<sup>37</sup> transmitted to us, both of them from Abū Khālid.<sup>38</sup> Abū Bakr said, ‘Abū Khālid al-Āḥmar transmitted to us from al-Ā‘mash,’ and he quoted the ḥadīth. His repetition of the reference to one of them in particular is an indication that the wording given was his.

When the transmitter does not single out one of the two teachers for mention, but instead takes portions from each and says, “X and Y informed us and they were similar in wording. They said, ‘Z informed us:’” this is not forbidden, according to the doctrine which permits relation by paraphrase. The statement of Abū Dāwūd [al-Sijistānī] – author of the *Sunan* – “Musaddad<sup>39</sup> and Abū Tawba<sup>40</sup> transmitted the sense to us. They said, ‘Abū ’l-Āḥwaṣ<sup>41</sup> transmitted to us,’” and things similar to this in his book may be instances of the first method; that is, the wording is that of Musaddad and Abū Tawba agrees with him in sense. It is also possible that they are instances of the second procedure; that is, Abū Dāwūd has not given the wording of one of them in particular but rather he has related it by paraphrase from both of them. This possibility is more likely when he says, “Muslim b. Ibrāhīm and Mūsā b. Ismā‘il<sup>42</sup> transmitted to us. The sense is the same. They said, ‘Abān<sup>43</sup> transmitted to us.’”

When the transmitter combines a number of teachers who have given the same sense and the text he produces is not the wording of every one of them and he says nothing to clarify that: this is something which Bukhārī and others

36 ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm (159/775–235/849), known as Abū Bakr b. Abī Shayba, was best known for his ḥadīth collection known as *Muṣannaf*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:108.

37 Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘īd b. Ḥuṣayn al-Ashajj (167/783–257/871) was an important early transmitter of hadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:134.

38 Abū Khālid Sulaymān b. Ḥayyān al-Āḥmar (114/732–189/805) was considered to be a reliable transmitter of hadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:19–21.

39 The ḥadīth of the Baṣrān Abu ’l-Ḥasan Musaddad b. Musarhad al-Asādī (ca. 150/767–228/843) were collected in a couple of small *musnads*; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:591–5.

40 The transmitter Abū Tawba al-Rabi‘ b. Nafī‘ al-Ḥalabī (ca. 150/767–241/855) was sought out by a number of his most important contemporaries; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:653–5.

41 Abu ’l-Āḥwaṣ Sallām b. Sulaym al-Ḥanafī (d. 179/795) transmitted a large number of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:281–4.

42 Abū Salama Mūsā b. Ismā‘il al-Minqārī (d. 223/838), known as “Tabūdhakī,” was considered one of the finest ḥadīth experts of his day in al-Baṣrā; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:360–5.

43 Abū Yazīd Abān b. Yazīd al-Āṭṭār was a Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth who seems to have died around 164/781; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:431–3.

condemn. There is nothing wrong with it under the doctrine which permits transmission by paraphrase.

When the transmitter hears a composition from a number of teachers and then collates his copy with the text of just one of them and he wants to mention all of them in the isnād and say, "The wording is that of X," as stated above: on the one hand, this may be permitted like the first case because he had heard the text which he gave with that particular reading from the person to whom he attributed the wording. On the other hand, it may be forbidden because he possesses no knowledge of the particulars of the relations of the others which would enable him to provide information about those relations. This is in contrast to the earlier case where the transmitter was acquainted with the relations of the teachers other than the one whom he ascribed the wording to and he knew that they agreed in regard to the sense, and so provided that information. God knows best.

12. The student should not add to the lineage (*nasab*) his teacher has given for the men above him in the isnād, interpolating the additional information into the isnād without any distinguishing break. If he makes a break, saying something like, "He is the son of X, from such-and-such place" (*huwa ibn fulān al-fulāni*), or, "That is the son of X" (*ya'ni ibn fulān*); it is permissible. The ḥadīth expert and authority Abū Bakr al-Barqānī (God bless him) said in his *Kitāb al-Luqāt* (*Book of Gleanings*), with his isnād, that 'Ali b. al-Madīnī said, "When a man transmits to you and says, 'X transmitted to us,' without providing the rest of his lineage, I think it best that you provide the rest of it. So say, 'He transmitted to us that (*anna*<sup>44</sup>) X b. Y transmitted to him.'" God knows best.

What if his teacher gave the lineage or description of his teacher at the beginning of the book or personal ḥadīth collection with the first ḥadīth from him, and for the later ḥadīth restricts himself to giving the name of his teacher or just part of his lineage? For instance, I relate a personal ḥadīth collection from Furāwī and I say at the beginning of it, "Abū Bakr Manṣūr b. 'Abd al-Mun'im b. 'Abd Allāh al-Furāwī informed us. He said, 'X informed us,'" and I say for the rest of his ḥadīth, "Manṣūr informed us, Manṣūr informed us." Is it licit for someone who heard that collection from me to relate separately from me some of the ḥadīth after the first ḥadīth and say for each of them, "X [that is, Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ] informed us. He said, 'Abū Bakr Manṣūr b. 'Abd al-Mun'im b. 'Abd Allāh al-Furāwī informed us.' He said, 'Y informed us,'" on the basis of my having mentioned Furāwī's full name at the beginning, even if I did not give it for each of the ḥadīth? The expert al-Khaṭīb has related that most scholars permitted this and for some the preferred way was to say, "*That is the son of X.*"

44 In Arabic, as in English, the nominalizing particle indicates that the material which follows is not a direct quotation. By using it the transmitter shows that he is paraphrasing the words of his teacher and thus avoids falsely ascribing to him something that he did not actually say.

He related, with his isnād, that Ahmād b. Ḥanbāl (God be pleased with him) said, “*That is the son of X,*” when the name of a man appeared without the lineage.<sup>45</sup>

Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī related from Barqānī, with the latter’s isnād, the statement we mentioned above from ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī. Then he said that he saw Abū Bakr Ahmād b. ‘Alī al-İsbahānī<sup>46</sup> – the sojourner in Nishapur, and he was one of the excellent experts and a pious and religious man – doing the same. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī asked him about many of the ḥadīth he related to him, saying for them, “Abū ‘Amr b. Ḥamdān informed us *that* Abū Ya‘lā Ahmād b. ‘Alī b. al-Muthannā al-Mawṣili informed them,” “Abū Bakr b. al-Muqrī<sup>47</sup> informed us *that* Ishāq b. Ahmād b. Nāfi<sup>48</sup> transmitted to them,” and, “The expert Abū Ahmād [b. ‘Adī] informed us *that* Abū Yūsuf Muḥammad b. Sufyān al-Şaffār<sup>49</sup> informed them.” He replied to him that they were ḥadīth which he had heard by recitation to his teachers from a number of texts at the beginning of which the teachers gave the lineages of those who transmitted the ḥadīth to them and the teachers limited themselves to mentioning just the name of the transmitters for the remainder of the ḥadīth.<sup>50</sup> Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī said, “Others used to say in cases like this, ‘X informed us. He said, ‘Y informed us’ – he is the son of Z,’ and then quote his lineage to its end. This is what I think is preferable because some transmitters used to say for the material licensed to them, ‘X informed us *that* Y transmitted to them.’”<sup>51</sup>

All of these ways are permissible and the best is to say, “He is the son of X,” or “*That is the son of X.*” Next best is to say, “*That X b. Y.*” The third best is to provide the exact form of the name given at the beginning of the volume without any break. God knows best.

13. In writing, it has become customary to omit “He said” (*qāla*) and the like between the transmitters of an isnād. Nevertheless, “He said” must be pronounced out loud when the text is recited. One of the things like this which is neglected is when “It was recited to X. Y informed you” appears in the course of an isnād. The person reciting should say for it, “[It was recited to X.] ‘Y informed you,’ *was said to him.*” “It was recited to X. Y informed us,” is sometimes found. “He said” should be included in this. What should be said is, “It was recited to X. *He said,* ‘Y transmitted to us.’” Indeed, this appears clearly written in some of the texts which have been related to us. When the word “He said” is repeated – as in the book of Bukhārī, “Şālih b. Ḥayyān transmitted to us. *He said,* ‘Āmir al-Sha‘bī said’” (*haddathanā Şālih ibn Hayyān qāla qāla ‘Āmir al-Sha‘bī*) – they

45 *Kifāya*, 215.

46 Abū Bakr Ahmād b. ‘Alī al-İsbahānī (347/958–428/1036), known as Ibn Manjuwayh, composed a number of books based on the major ḥadīth collections; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:230.

47 Abū Muḥammad Ishāq b. Ahmād b. Ishāq b. Nāfi<sup>52</sup> al-Khuza‘ī died in Mecca in 308/921; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:289.

48 I have not succeeded in finding any information about this individual.

49 *Kifāya*, 215–16.

50 *Kifāya*, 216.

omit one of them in writing. Nevertheless, the reciter must pronounce both of them. God knows best.

14. The famous *nuskhas*<sup>51</sup> containing a number of ḥadīth with a single isnād, like the *nuskha* of Hammām b. Munabbih<sup>52</sup> from Abū Hurayra, by the relation of ‘Abd al-Razzāq from Ma‘mar [b. Rāshid] from Hammām, and similar *nuskhas* and personal ḥadīth collections: some people mention the isnād anew at the beginning of each ḥadīth from these works. That is found in many old texts and it is the safest course. Others are satisfied to mention the isnād at the beginning of the text with the first ḥadīth or in the beginning of each of the sessions of audition, subsuming the rest of the ḥadīth under it and saying for each succeeding ḥadīth, “With the same isnād” (*bi-’l-isnād*), or “With it” (*bi-hi*). That is the more common and predominant way.

When someone who heard the ḥadīth this way wants to separate those ḥadīth and relate each with the isnād given at the beginning of the text: he is allowed to do this in the view of most people, including Waki‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ, Yahyā b. Ma‘in and Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī. This is because all of the ḥadīth are attached to the first ḥadīth so the isnād given in the beginning of the text is as good as mentioned for each ḥadīth. It is tantamount to dividing the text of a single ḥadīth between several subject headings under the isnād given at the beginning of the ḥadīth. (God knows best.) Some transmitters of ḥadīth reject presenting individually any of those ḥadīth subsumed under an isnād mentioned in the beginning and regard it as misrepresentation. One scholar of ḥadīth asked the professor Abū Ishāq al-Isfārāyīnī – the expert in practical and theoretical law – about this and he said that it is impermissible.

The person who heard something this way should also follow the same procedure. The correct way is for him to explain and relate the ḥadīth as it came. Muslim did this in his *Sahīh* for the *sahīfa* of Hammām b. Munabbih, saying, “Muhammad b. Rāfi‘ informed us. He said, ‘Abd al-Razzāq informed us. He said, Ma‘mar told us from Hammām b. Munabbih. He said, ‘This is what Abū Hurayra transmitted to us,’ and he mentioned some of the ḥadīth, including ‘The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “The lowest seat of one of you in heaven is that He says to him, ‘Hope for something,’ ”’ and so forth.”<sup>53</sup> Many compilers did that. God knows best.

15. When the transmitter gives the text of a ḥadīth – or the text of the ḥadīth and part of the isnād – before the isnād and then gives the isnād immediately after:

51 *Nuskha* and *sahīfa* appear to have been more or less interchangeable terms for the primitive ḥadīth collections bearing a single isnād; see M.M. Azami, *Studies in Early Hadith Literature* (Indianapolis, 1978), 29–30.

52 This famous *nuskha* (or *sahīfa*) was the ḥadīth collection of Abū ‘Uqba Hammām b. Munabbih al-Ṣan‘ātī (ca. 40/660–ca. 101/719); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:86.

53 *Jāmi‘ al-Sahīh*, 1:114 (K. al-Imān, B. Ma‘rifat ṭariq al-ru‘ya).

for instance, the transmitter says, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said such and such,” or “Amr b. Dīnār related from Jābir from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) such and such,” and he then says, “X informed us of it. He said, ‘Y informed us,’” and gives the isnād to the point where it connects with what he gave before.

That is related to the case where the student places the isnād [which his teacher gave after the text<sup>54</sup>] before the text so that with the isnād he makes the text “supported” rather than “loose.”

It has been reported that one of the earlier scholars of ḥadīth permitted someone who heard a ḥadīth from his teacher in this way to put the entire isnād in front of the text, putting the pieces together in that fashion, if he were to desire that.

It is natural that there is a difference of opinion over this like the one over placing part of the text ahead of another part of the text. Indeed, al-Khaṭīb related<sup>55</sup> that some people forbid that on the basis of the doctrine that relation by paraphrase is impermissible and that other people permit it on the basis of the doctrine that relation by paraphrasing is permissible – for there is no difference in that regard between [rearranging the elements of the text of a ḥadīth and moving the isnād given after the text in front of the text]. God knows best.

The practice of some of scholars of repeating the isnād at the end of the book or volume after giving it in the beginning: this does not stir up the controversy discussed above in connection with giving the isnād individually with each ḥadīth when it is related, because here the isnād is not connected with each one of them. Rather, it serves as a confirmation and safety measure [in case the first page of the text becomes lost] and enjoys a full authorization of the highest type. God knows best.

16. When a transmitter relates a ḥadīth with an isnād, follows it with another isnād and says at the end of that isnād, “A text like the previous one” (*mithluhū*): if his student wants to give only the second isnād and provide the wording of the ḥadīth given after the first isnād, this is most obviously forbidden. We heard that the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb (God bless him) said, “Shu‘ba used not to permit that. Some scholars said that that is permitted, when it is known that the original transmitter was accurate, mindful and believed in recognizing differences in wording and comparing texts letter for letter. If he is not known to be so, it is not permitted. More than one scholar, when they related something like that, used

<sup>54</sup> This would happen when the transmitter recited the ḥadīth without an isnād and his auditors then asked him for the isnād; see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kifāya*, 211–12.

<sup>55</sup> *Kifāya*, 170–1. For al-Khaṭīb’s discussion of rearranging the words in the text of a ḥadīth, see *Kifāya*, 175–7.

to give the isnād and say, ‘A ḥadīth like the previous one. Its text is such and such,’ and then provide the text. This also applies when the transmitter says, ‘A text similar to the previous one’ (*nāḥmūhū*). This is the procedure I prefer.”<sup>56</sup>

Abū Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. Abī Manṣūr ‘Alī b. ‘Alī al-Baghdādī<sup>57</sup> – the leading teacher in Baghdad – informed us through my recitation to him there. He said, My father (God bless him) informed me. He said, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Šarīfinī<sup>58</sup> informed us. He said, Abu ’l-Qāsim b. Ḥabābā<sup>59</sup> informed us. He said, Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Baghawī<sup>60</sup> transmitted to us. He said, ‘Amr b. Muḥammad al-Nāqid<sup>61</sup> transmitted to us. He said, Waki‘ transmitted to us. He said, “Shu‘ba said, ‘“X from Y: A text like the previous one” does not work.’” Waki‘ also said, “Sufyān al-Thawrī said, ‘It does work.’”

When a transmitter says, “a text similar to the previous one,” in this situation, some regard it as if he had said, “a text like the previous one.” It was communicated to us, with an isnād, that Waki‘ said, “Sufyān [al-Thawrī] said, ‘When a transmitter says, “a text similar to the previous one,” it is a valid ḥadīth,’ while Shu‘ba said, “a text similar to the previous one” contains doubt.”<sup>62</sup> Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn permitted what we stated above in regard to “a text like the previous one” and did not permit it for “a text similar to the previous one.” Al-Khaṭīb said, “This statement is in accordance with the doctrine of those who do not permit relation by paraphrase. According to the doctrine of those who permit it, there is no difference between ‘a text like the previous one’ and ‘a text similar to the previous one.’”<sup>63</sup>

This has a connection to what we heard from Mas‘ūd b. ‘Alī al-Sijzī<sup>64</sup> to the effect that he heard the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim saying, “One of the forms of accuracy and exactitude which is incumbent on a

<sup>56</sup> *Kifāya*, 212.

<sup>57</sup> Dīyār al-Dīn Abū Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. Abī Manṣūr ‘Alī b. ‘Alī al-Baghdādī (519/1125–607/1210), known as Ibn Sukayna, was, as indicated in the passage, a teacher of Ibn al-Šalāh. During his lifetime, he was famed for his elevated ḥadīth transmissions and his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 21:502–5.

<sup>58</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Šarīfinī (384/994–469/1076) was a preacher in the mosque of Šarīfin, a village near Baghdad. Many students sought him out as a transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:330–2.

<sup>59</sup> Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Sulaymān b. Ḥabābā al-Baghdādī (300/913–389/999) was a poorly known transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:548–9.

<sup>60</sup> Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Baghawī (214/829–317/929), also known as “Ibn bint [Aḥmad b.] Manī‘,” was a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth in Baghdad. He was a nephew of ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Makki; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:175.

<sup>61</sup> Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Amr b. Muḥammad al-Nāqid al-Baghdādī died in Baghdad in 232/847; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:147–8.

<sup>62</sup> *Kifāya*, 320.

<sup>63</sup> *Kifāya*, 213–14.

<sup>64</sup> Abū Sa‘īd Mas‘ūd b. ‘Alī al-Sijzī was a transmitter of ḥadīth praised for his accuracy who died in Nishapur in 477/1084; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:532–5.

ḥadithologist (*ḥadithi*) is to differentiate between using ‘a text like the previous one’ and ‘a text similar to the previous one.’ It is not licit for him to say ‘a text like the previous one,’ until he learns that the texts are identical in wording while he may say ‘a text similar to the previous one,’ if they have the same sense.” God knows best.

17. When a teacher gives the isnād of a ḥadīth, provides only the beginning of its text and then says, “And he [that is, his teacher] mentioned [the rest of] the ḥadīth” (*wa-dhakara l-ḥadīth*) or, “And he mentioned the ḥadīth in its entirety” (*wa-dhakara l-ḥadīth bi-tūlihi*): if his student wants to relate the ḥadīth from him in its full and complete form, it is more properly forbidden than the aforementioned case of the transmitter saying, “a text like the previous one,” or, “a text similar to the previous one.” The correct course is to make the situation clear by fully recounting what his teacher said, saying, “He said, ‘And he gave the ḥadīth in its entirety,’” and then say, “The ḥadīth in its entirety is such and such,” quoting it to its end. One of the scholars of ḥadīth asked Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Šāfi‘ī [al-Isfārāyīnī] – the prominent expert in positive law and legal theory – about this. He said, “It is not permissible for someone who heard a ḥadīth in this fashion to relate the ḥadīth with its full wording.” Abū Bakr al-Barqānī, the ḥadīth expert and jurist, asked the ḥadīth expert and jurist Abū Bakr al-İsmā‘īlī about someone who recited the isnād of a ḥadīth to a teacher and then said, “And he mentioned [the rest of] the ḥadīth.” Is it permissible for him to relate the entire ḥadīth? He said, “When the transmitter and the reciter know that ḥadīth, I hope it will be permitted. The evidence is best that he would give it accurately.” When we permit this, the reasoning is that the portion which the teacher did not mention is being transmitted by licensing. However, it is a certain and strong licensing in many respects. Therefore, in combination with the audition of the beginning of the text, the student is permitted to insert the remainder of the text without a license being specifically pronounced for it. God knows best.

18. It is obvious that it is not permissible to change “from the Prophet” (*‘an al-Nabi*) to “from the Messenger of God” (*‘an Rasūl Allāh*) (Peace be upon him), and the reverse is also true, even if transmission by paraphrase is permitted. In transmission by paraphrase, it is stipulated that the meaning [of the original wording and the paraphrased version] should not differ, but the meaning in this case is different. It is established that when “the Prophet” was in a book and the transmitter said, “from the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him), ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Hanbal saw his father strike out “the Prophet” and write “from the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him). Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said, “This is unnecessary. Aḥmad preferred adhering to the wording of the transmitter. However, his doctrine actually was to allow people to change the terms.”<sup>65</sup> Then

65 *Kifāya*, 244.

al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī stated, with his isnād, that Ṣalīḥ b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “I said to my father, ‘What do you think when “the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said” appears in a ḥadīth and someone changes it to “the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said”?’ He said, ‘I hope that there will be nothing wrong with it.’”<sup>66</sup> On the other hand, al-Khaṭīb stated, with his isnād, that Ḥammād b. Salama was transmitting ḥadīth while ‘Affān and Bahz<sup>67</sup> were before him. They began changing “the Messenger of God” (Peace be upon him) to “the Prophet” (Peace be upon him) and Ḥammād said to them, “You two will never understand.”<sup>68</sup> God knows best.

19. When the audition of a student is in some way defective: he must state this during his subsequent transmission of that material, and neglecting to do so is a form of misrepresentation. We have examples of this from the past. One of these is when the teacher transmits to the student from memory in the course of an informal session.<sup>69</sup> In that case, let the transmitter say, “X transmitted to us as a part of an informal session” (*haddathanā fulān mudhākarartan*), or, “X transmitted to us in the course of an informal session” (*haddathanā fi 'l-mudhākara*). More than one of the earlier scholars used to do this. A number of experts, including 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi and Abū Zur'a al-Rāzī,<sup>70</sup> used to forbid that anything be taken from them in an informal session. We also heard that from Ibn al-Mubārak and others. That is because of the laxity which prevails in an informal session, coupled with the fact that the human memory is treacherous. For this reason, a number of prominent experts, including Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with all of them), used their books to transmit the material they had memorized. God knows best.

20. When a ḥadīth is from two men, one of whom is discredited – for instance, a ḥadīth from Thābit al-Bunānī and Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh<sup>71</sup> from Anas – omitting the discredited transmitter from the isnād and mentioning only the reliable one is not condoned. This is out of fear that the ḥadīth contains something from the discredited transmitter which the reliable transmitter did not give. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and later Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb said something similar to this. Al-Khaṭīb said, “In cases like this, Muslim b. al-Hajjāj sometimes omitted the discredited

66 *Kifāya*, 244.

67 This seems to be a reference to the transmitter Abu 'l-Aswad Bahz b. Asad al-Baṣrī, who died in 197/813; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:192.

68 *Kifāya*, 244–5.

69 *Mudhākara*: an informal session where scholars would try to outdo one another in reciting ḥadīth from memory; see George Makdisi, *The Rise of Colleges*, (Edinburgh, 1981) 103–4.

70 Abū Zur'a Ubayd Allāh b. 'Abd al-Karīm al-Rāzī (200/815–264/878) was a prominent authority in ḥadīth from the city of al-Rayy; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:145.

71 Abū Ismā'īl Abān b. Abī 'Ayyāsh Fayrūz was a Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth from the second/eighth century. He was the less reliable transmitter of this pair; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 1(1):454; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):295–6.

transmitter from the isnād, mentioning the reliable transmitter and then saying, ‘And someone else’ (*wa-ākhar*), in allusion to the discredited transmitter. This declaration is valueless.”<sup>72</sup>

In the same way, when the ḥadīth is from two reliable transmitters, the student should not omit one of them, because of the aforementioned possibility affecting it, even if in this case the danger posed by the omission is less. Refraining from the omission of a transmitter in these two scenarios is not the same as refraining from something absolutely forbidden, because the presumption is that the two relations do agree and the aforementioned possibility [that one transmission contains material not included in the other] is remote and unlikely. It is a kind of interpolation the intentional commission of which is not permitted, as was discussed above in the Category on the interpolated ḥadīth. God knows best.

21. When the student hears one part of a ḥadīth from one teacher and the other part from another, confounds them so that he is no longer able to distinguish between the two parts and ascribes the ḥadīth to both of them, explaining that part of it is from one of them and part from the other: this is permissible.

Zuhri did this in the ḥadīth of the Lie (*ḥadīth al-ifk*)<sup>73</sup> which he related from ‘Urwa, Ibn al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama b. Waqqāṣ al-Laythī and ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utba<sup>74</sup> from ‘Ā’isha (God be pleased with her). He said, “All of them transmitted to me a portion of her ḥadīth. They said, ‘She said ...’”

The entire contents of that kind of ḥadīth is to be treated as if the teacher had related it ambiguously from one of the two men, so that when one of them is discredited, it is not permissible to cite any part of the ḥadīth. It is also impermissible for anyone after the mixing of the contents of the ḥadīth to omit the mention of either of the two transmitters and relate the ḥadīth solely from the other. Rather, it is necessary to mention them both and make a clear declaration that part of the ḥadīth is from one of them and part from the other. God knows best.

72 *Kifāya*, 378.

73 For this famous story, see Alfred Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishaq’s Strat Rasūl Allah* (Oxford, 1955), 494.

74 Abū ‘Abd Allah ‘Ubayd Allah b. ‘Abd Allah b. ‘Utba al-Hudhalī (d. 98/717) was a prominent legal scholar in Medina” Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:475–9.

## Category 27

### GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSMITTER OF ḤADĪTH

(*Ma‘rifat adāb al-muḥaddith*)

Some of these guidelines have already been treated where required in the previous Categories. The science of ḥadīth is a noble science consistent with good morals and virtuous habits and incompatible with bad morals and shameful habits. It is one of the sciences of the hereafter and not of this world. Let whoever seeks to take up teaching ḥadīth and lecturing on some of its sciences first make his intention sound and pure and cleanse his heart of earthly aims and their stains. Furthermore, let him be on guard against the affliction which comes from the love and heedlessness of rank.

There used to be disagreement over the age when it becomes suitable for a transmitter to take up teaching ḥadīth and to be appointed to relate them. Our view is that, when the need arises for the ḥadīth in his possession, it becomes desirable for him to take up relating and spreading them, no matter what his age is. We heard that the excellent judge Abū Muḥammad b. Khallād [al-Rāmahurmuzī] (God bless him) said, “On the basis of report and reflection, it seems correct to me that the appropriate age for a transmitter to begin teaching ḥadīth is fifty years because that is the end of middle age and when physical maturity is realized. Suḥaym b. Wathil’ said,

[I am] fifty years old, at the height of my powers.

The trickery of events has given me experience.

There is nothing wrong with his transmitting at forty because that is the threshold of maturity and the apogee of perfection. The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was informed of his mission when he was forty. At forty a person’s resolution and strength reach their peak and his intellect becomes abundant and his judgement is improved.”<sup>2</sup> Al-Qāḍī ‘Iyād disagreed with Ibn Khallād over this and said, “How many of the early pious forebears and other transmitters never reached that age, dying before then, but still spread ḥadīth and knowledge beyond calculation? ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz<sup>3</sup> died before forty and Sa‘id b. Jubayr<sup>4</sup> did not reach fifty,

---

1. The famous poet Suḥaym b. Wathil al-Riyāḥī was born before the advent of Islam and died around the year 40/661; Sezgin, *GAS*, 2:202–3.

2 Rāmahurmuzī, *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 352–3.

3 ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, sometimes referred to as ‘Umar II, was the sole representative of the Umayyad Dynasty respected by later religious scholars. He ruled in Damascus from 99/717 until his death in 101/720 at about thirty-eight lunar years of age; *EI*, 3:977–9; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:594.

4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Sa‘id b. Jubayr al-Asādī was a Follower and expert on Qur’ānic commentary. He was born in 45/665 and executed by the Umayyad governor al-Hajjāj in 95/714; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:28–9.

and the same is true of Ibrāhim al-Nakhaī. Mālik b. Anas conducted classes for the people in his early twenties – some say at seventeen years – and the people in his class were numerous, and this was while his own teachers were still alive. Likewise, Muḥammad b. Idris al-Shāfi‘ī taught at a young age and was appointed to do that.”<sup>5</sup> (God knows best.) What Ibn Khallād said is not objectionable. It should be understood that he said it regarding those who take up the transmission of ḥadīth without the necessary proficiency in the science on their own impulse which prematurely came upon them before the age he mentioned. In that case, they should teach ḥadīth only after attaining the age mentioned, for that is the time when there will probably be a need for their ḥadīth. As for those whom Ḥyāḍ mentioned who transmitted before that, it is obvious that this was because of their precocious proficiency in this science. In combination with this early proficiency, the need for them to teach became manifest to them or they were asked to do so, either by an explicit request or through the concatenation of circumstances, so they came to transmit before the stipulated age.

The age a transmitter should desist from relating ḥadīth: it is the age when it is feared that he may be senile or doting and that he will confuse ḥadīth and relate ḥadīth which are not his own. People differ according to personal circumstances as to when they reach this age. Likewise, let the transmitter who goes blind and fears that ḥadīth that are not his own will be imposed on him desist from transmitting. Ibn Khallād said, “What pleases me the most is that he desist at eighty, because that is the threshold of senility. However, if his mind remains firm and his judgement intact, and if he knows his ḥadīth and still occupies himself with them, taking care to transmit them in expectation of a heavenly reward; I wish the best for him.”<sup>6</sup> The reason for what he said is that in most cases the condition of an eighty-year-old has become weakened, and confusion and erring are to be feared from him, and this will not be detected in him until after he has confounded his ḥadīth. This happened to more than one reliable transmitter, including ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Sa‘id b. Abī ‘Arūba.<sup>7</sup> Many people have taught ḥadīth after surpassing this age and good fortune aided them and well-being accompanied them. These include the Companions Anas b. Mālik, Sahl b. Sa‘d,<sup>8</sup> and ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā,<sup>9</sup> as well as Mālik [b. Anas], al-Layth [b. Sa‘d], [Sufyān] b. ‘Uyayna and ‘Alī b. al-Ja‘d,<sup>10</sup> among a large number of early

5 *Ilmā‘*, 200–4.

6 Rāmahurmuzī, *Muhaddith al-fāṣil*, 354.

7 Abu ‘l-Naḍr Sa‘id b. Abī ‘Arūba Mihrān al-‘Adawi (ca. 70/689–156/773) was a Follower and renowned transmitter of ḥadīth in al-Baṣra until his reliability declined; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:91–2.

8 Abu ‘l-‘Abbās Sahl b. Sa‘d b. Mālik al-Khazrajī (d. ca. 90/709) was the last Companion of the Prophet to die in Medina; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:422–4.

9 ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā was the last living Companion in al-Kūfa. He died around the year 86/705 at nearly one hundred years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:428–30.

10 Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Baghawī collected the ḥadīth of the long-lived Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Alī b. al-Ja‘d b. ‘Ubayd al-Jawhari al-Baghdādī (ca. 134/751–230/845) in the popular *al-Ja‘diyāt* (ed. Rifā‘at Fawzī ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, 2 vols, Cairo, 1415/1994); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:105.

and late scholars. Their number includes several who transmitted ḥadīth after attaining the age of one hundred, including al-Ḥasan b. ‘Arafa,<sup>11</sup> Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Baghawī, Abū Iṣhāq al-Hujaymī<sup>12</sup> and the judge Abu ‘l-Tayyib al-Ṭabarī (God be pleased with all of them). God knows best.

A transmitter should not transmit in the presence of someone more deserving of that than he. When Ibrāhīm [al-Nakha‘ī] and Sha‘bī met, Ibrāhīm did not say anything. Someone added: “He disliked relating ḥadīth in a city where there was a transmitter more deserving than he on account of age or some other reason.” We heard that Yahyā b. Ma‘īn said, “When I transmit ḥadīth in a city containing someone like Abū Muṣ‘hir,<sup>13</sup> my beard should be shaved off [that is, his status as a scholar should be revoked].” We also heard from him, “Whoever transmits ḥadīth in a town containing someone more deserving to transmit than him is stupid.” When a transmitter is asked for something which he knows to be in the possession of someone else in his city or elsewhere with a more elevated isnād than his or an isnād preferable for some other reason, he should tell the student about that person and guide him to him. Giving good advice is part of religion.

The transmitter should not refrain from relating ḥadīth to someone on account of that person having an impure motive for learning ḥadīth, for it is to be hoped that he will obtain the necessary intention later on. We heard that Ma‘mar said, “People used to say, ‘Knowledge should be refused to the man who seeks it for something other than the sake of God in order that knowledge be for God (He is great and exalted).’” On the contrary, let the transmitter eagerly spread his knowledge, striving for a rich reward. Some of the pious forebears used to attract people to their ḥadīth, including ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr (God be pleased with them). God knows best.

Let the transmitter follow the example of Mālik (God be pleased with him), about which Abu ‘l-Qāsim al-Furāwī [that is, Abū Bakr or Abu ‘l-Faṭḥ Manṣūr b. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-Ṣā‘idī] informed us in Nishapur. He said, Abu ‘l-Ma‘āli [Muhammad b. Ismā‘il] al-Fārisī transmitted to us. He said, The expert Abū Bakr [Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn] al-Bayhaqī informed us. He said, The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Ḥakim] informed us. He said, Ismā‘il b. Muhammad b. al-Faḍl b.

<sup>11</sup> The collection of the ḥadīth of Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan b. ‘Arafa (150/767–257/871), known as *Juz’ Ibn ‘Arafa*, was one of the most popular works during the Ayyūbid era. At one point in his life he claimed to be 110 years old, although none of the birthdates or deathdates given for him allow this; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:134.

<sup>12</sup> When ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. Ahmad al-Bukhārī found the Baṣrān Abū Iṣhāq Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī al-Hujaymī (ca. 252/866–351/963), he was wearing a turban made up of a cloth wrapped around his head 103 times, indicating that he was 103 years old. He claimed that Hujaymī did not even begin to transmit until he reached the age of one hundred. Obviously there are problems with his dates; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:525–6.

<sup>13</sup> Abū Muṣ‘hir ‘Abd al-Āqā b. Muṣ‘hir al-Dimashqī (140/757–218/833) was one of the great critics of ḥadīth of his day; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:100–1.

Muhammad al-Sha‘rānī<sup>14</sup> informed me. He said, My grandfather<sup>15</sup> transmitted to us. He said, Ismā‘il b. Abī Uways transmitted to us. He said, “When Mālik b. Anas wanted to transmit, he used to perform his ablutions, sit on the edge of his bed and comb his beard. He sat erect, displaying gravity and reverence, and transmitted. He was asked about that and said, ‘I like to honor the ḥadīth the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). I transmit only in a state of ritual purity and sitting up straight.’ He used to dislike transmitting ḥadīth in the street or while standing or in haste. He said, ‘I like to try to understand what I transmit from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).’” It is also related that before teaching ḥadīth he used to perform the major ablation, fumigate his beard with incense and put on scent. If someone raised his voice in his class, he scolded him saying, “God (He is exalted) said, ‘Those of you who believe do not raise your voice over that of the Prophet.’<sup>16</sup> Whenever someone raises his voice during the recitation of the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), it is as if he raised his voice over that of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).”

We heard, or read, that the jurist Muhammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh<sup>17</sup> said, “When the reciter of the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) stands up for anyone [out of special respect, when that person enters the room], a sin is recorded against him.” It is better for him, as well as the participants in his class, to follow what was reported from Ḥabib b. Abī Thābit,<sup>18</sup> who said, “It is a sunna for a person to receive people, all of them, in a kindly fashion when he transmits ḥadīth to them.” God knows best.

The transmitter should not reel off the ḥadīth in such a fashion that some of them cannot be grasped.

Let the transmitter open and close his class with an invocation and prayer appropriate for the occasion. One of the most eloquent ways to open a class is by saying, “The most perfect praise belongs to God, Lord of the Worlds, under all circumstances. The most complete prayers and peace on the chief of the Messengers, whenever the heedful remember him and whenever the heedless neglect to remember him. God, pray over him, his family, the rest of the prophets, the family of each of them and the rest of the righteous to the greatest extent that it is right to ask for.”

<sup>14</sup> Abu ‘l-Hasan Ismā‘il al-Sha‘rānī was best known for his ḥadīth transmissions from his father and grandfather. He died in Bayhaq in 347/958; Sam‘ānī, *Ansāb*, 3:433.

<sup>15</sup> Abū Muḥammad al-Faḍl b. Muḥammad al-Sha‘rānī (d. 282/895) claimed that he had studied ḥadīth in every part of the Islamic world, with the exception of al-Andalus. He was a chief transmitter of a number of significant works; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:317–19.

<sup>16</sup> Qur‘ān 49:2.

<sup>17</sup> Abū Zayd Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Marwāzī (301/914–371/982) was an important figure in the history of the Shāfi‘īte law school; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:313–15.

<sup>18</sup> Abū Yaḥyā Ḥabib b. Abī Thābit al-Qurashī (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the chief ḥadīth transmitters in al-Kūfa; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:288–91.

It is desirable for a knowledgeable transmitter to convene a session for the dictation of ḥadīth, for it is one of the highest classes of transmitters.<sup>19</sup> Audition in such a session is one of the best and strongest ways to take up ḥadīth. When the crowd is large, let him take on a repetitor (*mustamli*) to broadcast from him. That is the custom of the greatest transmitters who undertook something like this. It was related that Mālik, Shu‘ba, Waki‘, Abū ‘Āsim,<sup>20</sup> Yazid b. Hārūn and a large number of other prominent earlier figures did that. Let his repetitor be educated and alert, in order that what we heard about Yazid b. Hārūn not befall him. Yazid was asked about a ḥadīth and said, “Several (*‘idda*) transmitted it to us.” His repetitor shouted to him, “Abū Khālid, who is ‘several’s’ father?” He replied, “Several, son of May I lose you!” Let the repetitor do his repeating elevated on a chair or something similar. If he cannot find anything suitable, let him perform his duty standing. He has to adhere to the wording of the transmitter and pass it on completely without any divergence. The benefit of the action of the repetitor is that someone who hears the words of the dictator from a distance attains an understanding and confirmation of what he is saying through the announcing of the repetitor. Those who hear only the speech of the repetitor [that is, those who cannot hear the dictator at all] do not thereby gain permission to relate the material directly from the dictator without explaining the circumstances. A discussion of that appeared above, in Category 24.

It is recommended that the class be opened with someone reciting part of the exalted Qur‘ān. When he finishes, if there is some noise, the repetitor should ask the participants in the class to be silent. Then he should say, “In the name of God, the Compassionate and Merciful,” praise God (He is blessed and exalted) and invoke blessings on the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), trying to be as eloquent as possible in that, and turn to the transmitter and say, “Whomever you mention or whatever you mention, may God bless you” – or, “may God have mercy on you” or something similar. God knows best.

Every time the transmitter mentions the Prophet (Peace be upon him), he should invoke blessings upon him. Al-Khaṭīb said that he should raise his voice for that.<sup>21</sup> When he comes across a mention of a Companion, he should say, “God be pleased with him” (*raḍiya ʹllāhu ‘anhu*).

It befits the transmitter to praise his teacher appropriately when he relates from him. Indeed, several of the pious forebears and scholars did that. For example, it is related that when ‘Aṭā b. Abī Rabāḥ transmitted from [‘Abd Allāh] b. ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them), he said, “The sea [of knowledge] (*al-bahr*) transmitted to me;” and that Waki‘ said, “Sufyān [al-Thawrī], the prince of the

19 *Fa-innahū min a‘lā marātib al-rāwīn*: the meaning of his clause is unclear to me. Nawawī replaced *al-rāwīn* with *al-riwāya* (transmission) in this passage; *al-Taqrīb li-’l-Nawawī* (Cairo, 1388/1968), 38.

20 Abū ‘Āsim al-Daḥḥāk b. Makhlaḍ b. al-Daḥḥāk al-Shaybānī al-Nabil (122/740–ca. 212/827) was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:480–5.

21 *Jāmi‘*, 297.

believers in ḥadīth, transmitted to us.” More important than that is the prayer for the teacher at the mention of his name. Let the transmitter not neglect that.

There is nothing wrong with the transmitter referring to someone he relates from with a nickname (*laqab*) he is known by, as *Ghundar* (troublemaker) is the nickname of Muḥammad b. Ja‘far,<sup>22</sup> the student of Shu‘ba, and *Luwayn* (party-colored) is the nickname of Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Miṣṣīṣī.<sup>23</sup> Or he may refer to his teacher by a maternal reference he is known by. For instance, Munya was the mother – or, it was said, the paternal grandmother – of the Companion Ya‘lā b. Munya,<sup>24</sup> and his father was Umayya. He may also refer to his teacher by reference to a bodily infirmity he was known for, for instance Sulaymān al-A‘mash (Bleary-eyed Sulaymān) and ‘Āsim al-Āḥwal (Cross-eyed ‘Āsim). All of this may be done unless the person referred to dislikes it. That was the case with Ismā‘il b. Ibrāhim,<sup>25</sup> known as “Ibn ‘Ulayya.” ‘Ulayya was his mother – or, it was said, his maternal grandmother. We heard that Yahyā b. Ma‘in used to say, “Isma‘il b. ‘Ulayya transmitted to us,” and Ahmad b. Ḥanbal forbade it. He said, “Say, ‘Ismā‘il b. Ibrāhim.’ I read that he did not use to like being referred to by the name of his mother.”<sup>26</sup> Yahyā b. Ma‘in replied, “We accept that from you, teacher of what is good.”

It has been recommended that the transmitter dictate ḥadīth from a number of his teachers, giving first the one with the most elevated isnād or the best for some other reason. He should dictate a single ḥadīth from each of his teachers, choosing the ḥadīth with elevated isnāds and short texts. That is best and most appropriate procedure. He should be discriminating in the ḥadīth he dictates and carefully consider the material he is to teach. He should draw attention to the lesson and elevation of the ḥadīth and what makes it special. He should avoid those things which the intellect of those present cannot grasp and those things he fears will introduce a misconception into their thinking.

It was the custom of some of those we have mentioned to conclude the session of dictation with stories, humorous tales and verses, with their isnāds; and that is fine. God knows best.

When the transmitter finds himself incapable of bringing forth a ḥadīth he wants to dictate, there is nothing wrong with his asking one of the experts present at that moment for help and his bringing it forth for him. Al-Khaṭīb said, “A number of our teachers used to do that.”<sup>27</sup>

22 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hudhalī al-Baṣrī (ca. 110/728–193/809) studied with Shu‘ba for twenty years; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:98–102. The story behind his nickname is discussed in Category 52.

23 Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Sulaymān was a scholar of ḥadīth who died in Adana around 245/859 at, it is said, over one hundred years of age; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:112.

24 Ya‘lā b. Munya (d. ca. 60/680) transmitted about twenty ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:100–1, s.n. Ya‘lā b. Umayya.

25 Abū Bishr Ismā‘il b. Ibrāhim b. Miqsam al-Asadī (110/728–193/809) was one of the greatest transmitters of his era; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:107–20.

26 When a person was referred to with the name of his mother, there was sometimes an implication that his birth was illegitimate and the identity of his father was unknown.

27 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī discusses this question in *Kifāya*, 216–17.

When the session of dictation is finished, there is no dispensing with collating the material, checking that it is accurate and correcting what became corrupted by a slip of the pen or an ink blot.

These are the key guidelines for the transmitter. We will be content with them in order to avoid prolixity by discussing matters which are either less important or obvious and unambiguous. God is the one who grants success. He knows best.

## Category 28

### GUIDELINES FOR THE STUDENT OF HADITH

(*Ma'rifat adab tālib al-hadīth*)

---

Some of these have already been treated above. The first thing incumbent on the student is to achieve true sincerity and to be on guard against taking up the study of ḥadīth as a means to gain some worldly aim. We heard that Ḥammād b. Salama (God be pleased with him) said, "Whoever studies ḥadīth for a reason other than for the sake of God is deluded." We heard that Sufyān al-Thawrī (God be pleased with him) said, "I know of no deed better than studying ḥadīth for someone who seeks God through it." We also heard something similar from Ibn al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him). One of the most likely reasons for making correct one's intention in the study of ḥadīth is the one we heard from Abū 'Amr Ismā'il b. Nujayd.<sup>1</sup> He asked Abū Ja'far Aḥmad b. Ḥamdān – and they were both righteous men – "With what intention should I write ḥadīth?" He said, "Do you not see that blessings come down at the mention of righteous people?" He said yes and Abū Ja'far said, "The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is the chief of the righteous people." So let the student ask God (He is blessed and exalted) for help, support, success and guidance. Let him adopt for himself pure morals and pleasing manners. Indeed, we heard that Abū 'Āsim al-Nabil said, "Whoever studies these ḥadīth studies the most elevated of religious matters. He needs to be the best kind of person."

There is a difference of opinion which was discussed above, at the beginning of Category 24, over the recommended age to begin hearing and writing ḥadīth. When the student starts to study ḥadīth, let him buckle down and work hard. He should begin by hearing ḥadīth from the teacher in his city with the best isnād and the one most worthy from the standpoint of knowledge, fame, nobility, and so forth, and then the next most worthy. When he finishes hearing the elevated and important ḥadīth of his own town, let him travel to other lands. We heard that Yāḥyā b. Ma'īn said, "There are four people in whom you cannot detect any proper behavior: the watchman of a street, the herald of a judge, the son of a ḥadīth transmitter and the man who writes ḥadīth in his own land and does not travel to study ḥadīth." We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) was asked, "Should a man travel to acquire elevation in ḥadīth?" He said, "Yes, by God! Energetically!" Hadīth from 'Umar [b. al-Khaṭṭāb] (God be pleased with him) used to reach 'Alqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswad<sup>2</sup> and they were not satisfied with them until they went to 'Umar and heard them from him directly."

---

1 Abū 'Amr Ismā'il b. Nujayd al-Sulamī (272/885–365/975) was a transmitter of ḥadīth known for his piety; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:183.

2 Abū Sallām al-Aswad b. Hilāl al-Kūfi (d. 84/703) was a Follower born in pre-Islamic times; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:257.

God knows best. We heard that Ibrāhim b. Adham<sup>3</sup> (God be pleased with him) said, “God (He is exalted) deflects adversity from this Community through the traveling of the scholars of ḥadīth.”

Acquisitiveness and greed should not cause the student to become lax in audition and taking up ḥadīth and fail to achieve what is stipulated for him in that regard in the fashion explained above.

Let the student put into practice the ḥadīth he hears pertaining to prayer, praising God and other virtuous acts. That is the tithe of ḥadīth, according to what we heard from the righteous man Bishr b. al-Ḥārith al-Ḥāfi<sup>4</sup> (God be pleased with him). We also heard that he said, “Scholars of ḥadīth, pay the tithe of these ḥadīth! For every two hundred ḥadīth, put five into practice.” We heard that ‘Amr b. Qays al-Mulā’ī<sup>5</sup> (God be pleased with him) said, “When you read about something good, do it. Even if you do it only once, you will be a practitioner of it.” We heard that Waki‘ said, “If you want to learn ḥadīth, put them into practice!”

Let the student exalt his teacher and whomever else he hears ḥadīth from. That is part of the glorification of ḥadīth and knowledge. He should not pester his teacher, nor take up so much of his time that he annoys him. It is feared that whoever does that will be kept from receiving any benefit. Indeed, we heard that Zuhri said, “When the class goes on too long, the Devil takes part in it.”

The student who succeeds in acquiring the audition of a particular teacher and conceals it from others so that he alone will be distinguished by it is unworthy of benefiting from it. That is one of the forms of wickedness into which ignorant and low students fall.

Teaching is one of the first benefits of studying ḥadīth. We heard that Mālik (God be pleased with him) said, “One of the blessings of ḥadīth is teaching one another.” We heard that Ishāq b. Ibrāhim b. Rāhawayh said to one member of a group that heard ḥadīth from him, “Copy the ḥadīth I have recited from their book.” The student replied, “They will not let me.” Ibn Rāhawayh said, “Then, by God, they will not prosper. We have seen many people who forbade this ‘audition, and, by God, they did not prosper or find success!” We too have seen people who forbade audition and they did not prosper or find success. We ask God for well-being. God knows best.

Let the student not be one of those whom bashfulness or pride keep from collecting large numbers of ḥadīth. We heard that Mujāhid (God be pleased with him) said, “The bashful person and the prideful person cannot acquire knowledge.” We heard that ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭāb and his son (God be pleased

<sup>3</sup> Abū Ishāq Ibrāhim b. Adham al-‘Ijli was a famous early mystic. He was born in Balkh around 112/730 and is said to have been a prince. He moved to Syria and led a wandering existence living off the fruits of his own labor until his death around 161/778; *EP*, 3:985–6.

<sup>4</sup> Abū Naṣr Bishr b. al-Ḥārith al-Ḥāfi (ca. 150/767–ca. 227/841) was an influential early mystic; *EP*, 1:1244–6; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:638.

<sup>5</sup> ‘Amr b. Qays al-Mulā’ī al-Bazzāz instructed Sufyān al-Thawrī in the Qurān and the inheritance laws; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:250–1.

with them) said, “Whosoever’s face is soft [that is, whosoever is bashful], his knowledge is soft.” He should not be too haughty to write ḥadīth from which he will derive benefit from someone inferior to him. We heard that Waki‘ b. al-Jarrāḥ (God be pleased with him) said, “A scholar of ḥadīth does not become noble until he writes ḥadīth from someone superior to him, someone of the same rank and someone inferior to him.

Someone who wastes any of his time trying to study with many teachers merely to acquire the reputation of having had many teachers and the fame that comes with that will not be successful. The words of Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī do not refer to this; that is, “When you write ḥadīth, take everything. When you transmit, be selective.”

Let the student write and hear the books and personal collections that he comes across in their entirety, not just excerpts. Ibn al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him) said, “I never made excerpts of a scholar’s ḥadīth without regretting it later.” We heard that he also said, “Someone cannot take excerpts from the transmission of a scholar without it being a sin.” We heard or read that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn said, “Those who excerpt ḥadīth will come to regret it later when their regret will do them no good.” If circumstances make it difficult for the student to take all of a transmitter’s ḥadīth and he is compelled to be selective and make excerpts, he should take that on personally, if he is qualified, discriminating and knowledgeable of the ḥadīth suitable for selection and excerpting. If he is not up to that, he should seek the help of one of the experts to make the excerpts for him. A number of experts used to engage in selecting the ḥadīth of their own teachers while the students listened to and recorded their selections, including Ibrāhīm b. Urama al-İsbahānī,<sup>6</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad – known as ‘Ubayd al-Ṭīl<sup>7</sup> – Abu ‘l-Hasan al-Dāraqutnī and Abū Bakr al-Jī‘abī<sup>8</sup> among others. The prevailing custom was for the expert to draw a sign on the selected ḥadīth in the text of the teacher. Abu ‘l-Hasan al-Nu‘aymī<sup>9</sup> used to mark his selections with an elongated letter *sād*; Abū Muḥammad al-Khallāl<sup>10</sup> with an elongated letter *tā’* and Abu ‘l-Fadl al-Falakī<sup>11</sup> with the shape of two *hamzas*. All of them made their

<sup>6</sup> Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Urama (or Urama) al-İsbahānī was an early expert in ḥadīth who died at the end of 266/880; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:145–6.

<sup>7</sup> ‘Ubayd al-Ṭīl was a student of Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn who died in 294/907 in his eighties. Other sources give his *kunya* as Abū ‘Alī; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:90–1.

<sup>8</sup> Abu Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Umar b. Muḥammad al-Jī‘abī (284/897–355/966) was a Shiīte scholar of ḥadīth who served as a judge in Mosul; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:88–92.

<sup>9</sup> Abu ‘l-Hasan ‘Alī b. Aḥmad b. al-Hasan al-Nu‘aymī was an inhabitant of Baghdad renowned for his expertise in ḥadīth, theology and literature who died in 443/1051 in his eighties; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:445–7.

<sup>10</sup> Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Abī Ṭālib Muḥammad al-Khallāl al-Baghdādī (352/963–439/1047) was a Baghdadi transmitter who worked extensively in the field of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:232.

<sup>11</sup> Abu ‘l-Fadl ‘Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad al-Hamadhānī al-Falakī (d. 427/1036) wrote a number of books, including a *tabaqāt*-work entitled *al-Muntahā fī ma‘rifat al-rijāl*; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:502–4.

signs in ink in the right margin of the page. Dāraqutnī marked the chosen ḥadīth with a broad line of red ink in the left margin and the expert Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Lālakāpī<sup>12</sup> used to mark them with a short penstroke in red at the beginning of the isnād of the selected ḥadīth. There is no problem with any of that: to each his own.

The student of ḥadīth should not limit himself to hearing ḥadīth and writing them down, without trying to gain knowledge from them and understand them. Then he would have worn himself out without accomplishing anything and without entering into the ranks of the scholars of ḥadīth. Rather, he would not become anything more than one of the deficient imitators who attempt to adorn themselves with something they actually lack. Abu 'l-Muẓaffar, the son of the expert Abū Sa'īd al-Samānī (God bless him), personally declaimed to me in the city of Marv. He said, My father declaimed to us, either personally or by recitation to him. He said, Muḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Salāmī himself declaimed to us. He said, The surpassing litterateur Fāris b. al-Ḥusayn<sup>13</sup> himself declaimed to me

Student whose time has come to transmit,  
In transmitting, pay attention to transmitting and understanding  
Transmit only a few ḥadīth and husband them carefully  
for knowledge is infinite.

Let the student first direct his attention to the two *Sahīhs* [that is, those of Bukhārī and Muslim], then Abū Dāwūd's *Sunan*, Nasā'i's *Sunan* and the book of Tirmidhi; mastering their difficulties and attempting to understand their obscurities. He should not be misled about Bayhaqī's *Kitāb al-Sunan al-kabīr*, for we do not know the like of it in its field. Then, he should devote himself to the rest of the works a scholar of ḥadīth has need of, including the *musnads*, like *Musnad Ahmad* [*ibn Hanbal*]; the comprehensive collections arranged by legal topic containing supported and unsupported ḥadīth and Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* is the foremost of these; the books on the defects in ḥadīth (*'Ilal al-ḥadīth*) – Ahmad b. Hanbal's *Kitāb al-'Ilal*<sup>14</sup> (*The Book of Defects*) and Dāraqutnī's *Kitāb al-'Ilal*<sup>15</sup> are among the finest of these; the books containing information about transmitters and when they lived – Bukhārī's *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr* (*Great History*) and Ibn Abī Ḥātim's *Kitāb al-Jarh wa-'l-ta'dil* (*Book of Personality Criticism*) are among the best of these; and the books on clarifying

12 Abu 'l-Qāsim Hibat Allāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Lālakāpī (d. 418/1027) composed a famous collection of credal statements entitled *Sharh uṣūl i'tiqād ahl al-sunna wa-'l-jamā'a* (ed. Ahmād Sa'īd Ḥamdān, 2nd edn, 4 vols, Riyādh, 1411); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:501.

13 The sources I consulted take no notice of this poet.

14 *Kitāb al-'Ilal wa-ma'rīfāt al-rījāl*, 2 vols (Istanbul, 1987).

15 *Kitāb al-'Ilal al-wārida fi 'l-ahādīth al-Nabawīya*, ed. Maḥfūz al-Rāhmān Zayn Allāh al-Salāfi (Riyādh, 1405/1985).

problematic names – the most complete of these is *al-Ikmāl* (*Perfection*) of Abū Naṣr b. Mākūlā.<sup>16</sup>

Whenever the student encounters a problematic name or difficult word in a ḥadīth, let him research it and commit it to memory. That way he will easily gain a good deal of knowledge.

Let him memorize ḥadīth gradually, little by little, over several days and nights. That is the best way for him to master the material to be learned. That practice is reported from a number of early experts in ḥadīth, including Shu‘ba, Ibn ‘Ulayya and Ma‘mar. We heard that Ma‘mar said, “I heard Zuhri saying, ‘Whoever seeks knowledge as a whole, loses it as a whole. Knowledge is acquired only a ḥadīth or two at a time.’”

Let exactitude be the student’s concern. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi said, “Learning is exactitude.”

Repeating to others ḥadīth one is trying to memorize is one of the most powerful ways to master them. We heard that ‘Alqama [b. Qays] al-Nakha‘ī said, “Repeat the ḥadīth amongst yourselves! They live through being spoken,” and “Whoever is pleased to learn ḥadīth, let him transmit them; even if he has to transmit them to someone who does not desire them.”

Let the student occupy himself with compiling, composing and arranging, when he becomes ready and qualified for that. As the expert al-Khaṭīb said, “It makes the memory firm, kindles the heart, hones one’s character, improves clarity, uncovers the unclear, brings good repute and immortalizes one to the end of time. Rarely does one become adept in the science of ḥadīth, fathom its obscurities and discern its hidden points without doing that.”<sup>17</sup> The expert Ṣūrī – Muḥammad b. ‘Alī<sup>18</sup> – transmitted, saying, “I saw the expert Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ghani b. Sa‘id in a dream and he said to me, ‘Abū ‘Abd Allāh, compile and arrange before it becomes impossible for you. This is my case. You see that it has become impossible for me.’”<sup>19</sup>

The scholars of ḥadīth followed two courses in arranging the material.

1. Arrangement by legal topic (*‘ala ’l-abwāb*): this is the inclusion of ḥadīth according to the legal issue, and so forth that they address, and grading them by type,<sup>20</sup>

16 Abū Naṣr ‘Alī b. Hibat Allāh b. Mākūlā (422/1031–486/1093 or 487) was a Baghdadi scholar of ḥadīth who wrote a number of works, including *al-Ikmāl fi raf‘ al-irtiyāb ‘an al-mu‘talif wa-’l-mukhtalif min al-asma‘ wa-’l-kunā wa-’l-ansāb* (ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yahyā al-Mu‘allimī al-Yamānī, 6 vols, Hyderabad, 1962–7). His slaveboy robbed and killed him in al-Ahwāz; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:569–78.

17 *Jāmi‘*, 415.

18 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Ṣūrī (ca. 376/986–441/1049) instructed al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in the science of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:233.

19 This is a curious anecdote. The implication would seem to be that ‘Abd al-Ghani b. Sa‘id died without writing anything, although that was far from being the case.

20 *Wa-tanwīfuhū anwā‘an*: it is very difficult to divine what the *anwā‘* are supposed to be here. This section is closely based on al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī’s *Jāmi‘* (pp. 417–18), where *naw‘* is

bringing together the relevant material for each legal issue and each type, subject by subject.

2. Arrangement of the ḥadīth by *musnad* (*'ala 'l-masānid*) and the collection of the ḥadīth of each Companion individually, even if the types of the ḥadīth differ: those who choose this approach may order the Companions alphabetically by name. He may also order them by tribe, beginning with the Banū Hāshim [that is, the tribe of the Prophet], and then the closest in regard to blood ties to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and then the next closest. He may also order the Companions by the various measures of precedence applied to them. So he should begin with the Ten [who were granted the glad tidings of their acceptance into Paradise];<sup>21</sup> then the Muslim participants in the battle of Badr; then the people of al-Hudaybiya;<sup>22</sup> then those who converted to Islam and went to Medina after the time of al-Hudaybiya and before the conquest of Mecca. He should conclude with the youngest Companions, like Abu 'l-Tufayl<sup>23</sup> and his peers, and finally the women. This is the best way, and the first [that is, alphabetical arrangement] is the easiest. There are also other arrangements.

One of the most elevated ways to arrange ḥadīth is the analytical (*mu'allaq*) which collects the chains of transmission for each ḥadīth and notes the differences in the transmitters of it. Ya'qūb b. Shayba did this in his *Musnad*.<sup>24</sup>

Another kind of composition with which some occupy themselves is the collection of teachers (*jam'i al-shuyūkh*); that is, the collection of the ḥadīth of particular teachers, each one of them separately. 'Uthmān

\* used both as a synonym of *bāb* (legal topic) and in reference to the quality of the isnād attached to the ḥadīth; that is, he says that the two *naw'*s are supported (*musnad*) and unsupported (*mawqūf* and *mursal*).

21 In addition to the four caliphs, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī, the Ten included Talḥa, al-Zubayr, 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Awf, Sa'īd b. Abī Waqqāṣ and Sa'īd b. Zayd. There was a disagreement as to whether the tenth was Abū Ubayd b. al-Jarrāḥ or the Prophet himself; *EP*, 1:693.

22 In the year 6/628, during the negotiations with the pagans at the village of al-Hudaybiya outside of Mecca, the Muslims made the Pledge of Good Pleasure (*bay'at al-ridwān*), promising to obey the Prophet; *EP*, 3:539.

23 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 2:798–9, 4:1696–7.

24 This work is described in al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rīkh Baghdaḍā*, 14:281 and Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:cols. 1678–9 (as *Musnad Ibn Shayba Ya'qūb al-hāfiẓ*). If it had been completed, it would have been enormous. The portion which has survived was published in Beirut in 1940. According to Sakhāwī, the purpose of this approach was to facilitate the exposure of anomalies in the lines of transmission; for instance, hidden cases of *irsāl* (looseness); *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:342–3.

b. Sa‘īd al-Dārimī<sup>25</sup> said, “It is said that whoever does not collect the ḥadīth of these five is bankrupt in ḥadīth: Sufyān [al-Thawrī], Shu‘ba, Mālik, Ḥammād b. Zayd and [Sufyān] b. ‘Uyayna. They are the bases of right religion.” The scholars of ḥadīth collect the ḥadīth of many people beside those Dārimī mentioned, including Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī, Zuhri and Awzāqī.

They also collect “headings” (*tarājim*) and these are isnāds, singling out the texts they appear with and collecting them in book form, like the heading of Mālik from Nāfi‘ from [‘Abd Allāh] b. ‘Umar, the heading of Suhayl b. Abī Ṣalīḥ from his father [that is, Abū Ṣalīḥ Dhakwān] b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Sammān] from Abū Hurayra, the heading of Hishām b. ‘Urwa from his father [‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr] from ‘Ā’isha and there are many similar ones.

They also collect individual chapters from the comprehensive books arranged according to legal issue, for instance the chapter on seeing God (He is great and exalted) in the hereafter (*rūyāt Allāh*), the chapter on raising the hands in prayer (*raf‘ al-yadayn*), the chapter on recitation behind the prayer leader (*al-qirā'a khalfā 'l-imām*), and so forth. Then they put them separately in book form, so they become individual monographs.<sup>26</sup>

They also treat certain ḥadīth separately, collecting their lines of transmission in individual monographs, like the lines of transmission of the ḥadīth regarding the taking away of knowledge (*qabḍ al-‘ilm*) and the ḥadīth regarding the major ablution on Friday (*al-ghusl yawma 'l-jum‘a*), and so forth.

Earlier scholars collected and arranged in monographs the ḥadīth belonging to many of the Categories treated in this book of ours.

In all of this, the student must make his purpose sound and be on guard against the aim of merely striving for large numbers and the like. We read that Ḥamza b. Muḥammad al-Kinānī published a single ḥadīth with about two hundred lines of transmission and was pleased with that. He saw Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn in a dream and mentioned that to him. Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn replied, “I fear this comes under the heading of ‘Your god is competition in quantity.’”<sup>27</sup>

25 Abū Sa‘īd ‘Uthmān b. Sa‘īd al-Dārimī (ca. 200/816–280/894) was a scholar of ḥadīth best known today for two theological works, *al-Naqd ‘ala 'l-Marisi al-ṣanid* (ed. M.H. Fiqi, Cairo, 1358) and *al-Radd ‘ala 'l-Jahmiya* (ed. G. Vitestam, Leiden, 1960); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:600–1; *EIr*, 7:31–2.

26 Sakhawī lists a number of such books in *Fath al-Mughith*, 2:343.

27 Qur‘ān, 102:1.

Let the student be careful to bring forth his compositions to the public only after he has polished, refined and reviewed them again and again.

Let the student be on guard against collecting something he is not yet qualified for in an attempt to reap the fruit and seize the profit of collecting it. This way the verdict against him will not be the one we heard from 'Ali b. al-Madīnī, "When you see a youth who, the first time he records ḥadīth, collects the ḥadīth regarding the major ablution (*ḥadīth al-ghusl*) and the ḥadīth 'Whoever ascribes a lie ...' (*ḥadīth man kadhaba*) write on the nape of his neck, 'He will not prosper.'"

*This book* is an entryway into the study of ḥadīth, an attempt to make clear its main and secondary issues and to explain the terminology, aims and concerns of its practitioners. Ignorance of these matters greatly impairs a transmitter. This book is – God willing – worthy of receiving attention before any other. We beseech God (He is praised) for His great grace. He knows best.

Category 29  
ELEVATED AND LOW ISNĀDS

(Ma'rifat al-isnād al-'ali wa-'l-nāzil)

In the first place, the principle of the isnād is an excellent characteristic of this community and an outstanding example of a confirmed sunna. I heard from more than one source that 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak (God be pleased with him) said, "The isnād is part of religion. If it were not for the isnād, whoever wanted would have said whatever he wanted." Seeking elevation (*'ulūw'*) in ḥadīth is also a sunna. For that reason, undertaking journeys was recommended, as stated above.<sup>1</sup> Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, "Seeking an elevated isnād is a sunna from those who came before." Indeed, we heard that in his final illness Yaḥyā b. Ma'īn (God be pleased with him) was asked, "What do you desire?" He replied, "An empty house and an elevated isnād."

Elevation keeps defectiveness away from the isnād, because it is possible for defectiveness to come, either inadvertently or deliberately, from every transmitter in the isnād. Therefore, a small number of transmitters represents a small number of sources of defectiveness and a large number of men represents a large number of sources of defectiveness. This much is patently clear. The elevation sought in the transmission of ḥadīth has five subcategories:

1. Proximity (*qurb*) to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) through a clean, unweak isnād:<sup>2</sup> that is one of the most noble types of elevation. We heard that the ascetic and scholar Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭūsī<sup>3</sup> (God be pleased with him) said, "Proximity in the isnād is proximity" – or "a means to gain proximity" – "to God (He is exalted and great)." He is right, because proximity in the isnād is proximity to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and proximity to him is proximity to God (He is exalted and great).
2. The second subcategory is the one the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim mentioned,<sup>4</sup> that is, proximity to one of the authorities of ḥadīth, even if there are a large number of intermediaries between that authority and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): when that is found in an isnād, it is described as elevation in view of its proximity to that authority, even if it is not elevated in relation to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). The remarks of al-Ḥākim

---

1 See p. 175.

2 *Bi-isnād naẓif ghayr ḫaṭif*: This does not seem to have been a technical formulation, although its basic significance seems clear.

3 Abu 'l-Ḥasan Muḥammad b. Aslam al-Ṭūsī (ca. 180/796–242/856) was an early mystic; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:195–207.

4 *'Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 11.

create the false impression that proximity to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is not counted as a desirable form of elevation at all. This is an error regardless of who says it, because proximity to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) with a clean, unweak isnād is more deserving of being called “elevation” and no one who possesses a grain of knowledge can dispute that. It would seem that al-Ḥākim sought by these remarks of his to establish the validity of elevation in an isnād based on its proximity to an authority, even if the isnād is not close to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and to censure those who in this regard pay attention to the mere proximity of the isnād to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), even if it is a weak isnād. For that reason, he gave the ḥadīth of Abū Hudba, Dīnār, al-Ashājj and their peers<sup>5</sup> as examples of proximity to the Prophet. God knows best.

3. Elevation in relation to the transmission of one or both of the *Ṣaḥīḥs* [that is, those of Bukhārī and Muslim] or the other famous, authoritative books: the “agreements” (*muwāfaqāt*), “substitutions” (*abdāl*), “equivalence” (*musāwāh*) and “hand-shaking” (*muṣāfaḥa*) which have lately become famous refer to this. Later transmitters of ḥadīth have come to pay a good deal of attention to this type of elevation. Some of those whom I found mentioning this type of elevation in their remarks are the expert Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb, some of his teachers, Abū Naṣr b. Mākūlā, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Humaydī and others of their generation as well as those who came after them.

*Agreement (muwāfaqa)*: it is when a ḥadīth comes to you from the teacher who transmitted it to Muslim, for instance, with an elevated isnād with fewer intermediaries than the ḥadīth has when you relate it from Muslim from his teacher.

*Substitution (abdāl)*: an example of this would be that for a particular ḥadīth the same elevation described above comes to you from a teacher other than the teacher of Muslim.<sup>6</sup> Sometimes “substitution” is called

5 This is a reference to a passage in *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth* (pp. 9–10). All of these individuals were shameless liars who claimed to be much older than they actually were in order to make their ḥadīth attractive to gullible students seeking short isnāds. Abū Hudba Ibrāhīm b. Hudba al-Fārisī died shortly after the year 200/816 and claimed to be a student of the Companion Anas b. Mālik (d. ca. 90/709); Dhahabī, *Mīzān*, 1:71–2; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, 1:119–21. Similarly, in the year 240/855 Abū Mikyās Dīnār b. ‘Abd Allāh (*not* “Abd Allāh b. Dīnār” as in *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth*) al-Ḥabashī was transmitting directly from Anas; Dhahabī, *Mīzān*, 2:30–1; Ibn Ḥajar, *Lisān*, 2:434–5. According to al-Ḥākim, Abu ‘l-Dunyā Uthmān b. al-Khaṭīb b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Ashājj al-Maghribī maintained that he had been a servant of the caliph ‘Alī and was kicked by his mule.

6 This, of course, is rather vague and later writers on the subject do not offer much help. As in the example Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ provided, it appears that this term was most often applied to cases where the student’s and the compiler’s isnāds intersect at the level of the teacher of the compiler’s teacher. An example cited by Suyūṭī seems to indicate that the intersection could also occur earlier in the line of transmission; *Tadrib al-rāwī*, 2:166.

“agreement” so the example we cited may be said to be “an elevated agreement in respect to the teacher of Muslim’s teacher.” Even if the isnād had not been elevated, it still would have been an instance of “agreement” and “substitution.” However, [in practice] these terms would not be applied to a unelevated isnād, because there is no interest in that kind of ḥadīth.

*Equivalence (musāwāh):* in our day, it is when the number of intermediaries in your isnād is fewer, not to the teacher of Muslim and his peers nor to the teacher of his teacher, but rather to someone more remote than that, like the Companion or someone near him – and this may even be to the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) – so that the number of intermediaries between you and, for instance, the Companion is the same as the number between Muslim and that Companion. So you are therefore “equal” (*musāwiyan*) to, for instance, Muslim in regard to proximity of isnād and the number of transmitters in the isnād.

*Hand-shaking (muṣāfaha):* This is when the “equivalence” we described belongs to your teacher rather than to you. So you have “hand-shaking” because it is as if you had in that ḥadīth “met” Muslim and “shook hands with him” through it, on account of your having met your teacher who is “equal” to Muslim. If the “equivalence” belongs to the teacher of your teacher, the hand-shaking goes to your teacher. So you can say, “It is as if my teacher heard Muslim and shook his hand.” If the “equivalence” belongs to the teacher of your teacher’s teacher, then the hand-shaking belongs to your teacher’s teacher. Then you can say regarding it, “It is as if the teacher of my teacher heard Muslim and shook his hand.” It is better that you do not mention any connection to yourself for that, but rather say, “It is as if X heard it from Muslim,” without saying for it, “My teacher” or “The teacher of my teacher.”

It will not remain hidden to someone who gives it some thought that, in a case of “equivalence” and “hand-shaking” accruing to you, your isnād and the isnād of Muslim, or someone like him, will converge only at a distance from the teacher of Muslim; for example, on the Companion or someone close to him. If the “hand-shaking” which you mention does not belong to you, but rather to one of the transmitters above you in your isnād, the convergence of the two isnāds can happen at the teacher of Muslim or his peers and the “hand-shaking” then is mixed with “agreement.” The sense of “agreement” refers to a special form of “equivalence” and “hand-shaking” since it means that one of the earlier transmitters of your elevated isnād was “equal” to or “shook hands” with Muslim or Bukhārī, because that transmitter heard the ḥadīth from someone who heard it from the teacher of Bukhārī or Muslim [in the case of “hand-shaking”], despite the posteriority of that transmitter’s generation in relation to theirs. For the reason we gave, one finds instances of “hand-shaking” along with the

“agreements” and “substitutions” in many of the elevated ḥadīth supplied by those who first spoke about this Category and their contemporaries.

Be aware that this type of elevation is elevation dependant on lowness (*nuzūl*), since if it were not for the lowness of the authority in his isnād, you would not be elevated in your isnād. In Marv I had recited to our prolific teacher Abu 'l-Muẓaffar 'Abd al-Raḥīm – the son of the author Abū Sa'īd al-Sam'ānī (God bless them) – from the *Collection of Forty Ḥadīth (arba'i)* of Abu 'l-Barakāt al-Furāwī a ḥadīth regarding which Furāwī claimed that it was as if he himself – or his teacher – had heard it from Bukhārī. The teacher Abu 'l-Muẓaffar said, “It is not elevated in relation to you, rather it is low in relation to Bukhārī.” This is a good and clever response which takes this type of elevation down a notch. God knows best.

4. One of the types of elevation is the elevation derived from a transmitter dying early. An illustration of this is a ḥadīth I relate from a teacher who informed me from someone else from the expert Bayhaqī from the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim. It is more elevated than my relation of that same ḥadīth from a teacher who informed me from someone from Abū Bakr b. Khalaf<sup>7</sup> from al-Ḥākim, despite both isnāds having the same number of intermediaries, because Bayhaqī predeceased Ibn Khalaf. Bayhaqī died in 458 [1066 AD] and Ibn Khalaf in 487 [1094 AD]. We heard that the expert Abū Ya'qūb al-Khalil b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khalili (God – He is exalted – bless him) said, “Sometimes one isnād is more elevated than another because its transmitter died earlier, even if both are equal in the number of intermediaries.”<sup>8</sup> As an example of this he cited one of his own ḥadīth similar to the one I mentioned above. This is a discussion of elevation based on priority of death derived from the comparison of one teacher with another and the measuring of one against another.

As for elevation derived solely from your teacher dying early without regard to measuring him against another transmitter, one of the people concerned with this made the threshold fifty years. That is what we heard from Abū 'Alī al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Nīsābūrī. He said, “I heard Aḥmad b. ʿUmayr al-Dimashqī<sup>9</sup> – and he was one of the pillars of ḥadīth – saying, ‘The isnād of fifty years from the death of the teacher is an isnād possessing elevation.’” One of the things that we hear from the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda is that he said, “When thirty years elapse on an isnād, it is elevated.” This threshold is broader than the first. God knows best.

7 Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī b. 'Abd Allāh al-Shīrāzī al-Nīsābūrī (398/1008–487/1094), known as Ibn Khalaf, was an expert in literature and ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:478–9.

8 *Kitāb al-Irshād fi 'Ulumā' al-ḥadīth*, ed. Muḥammad Sa'īd b. 'Umar Idris, 3 vols (Riyadh, 1409/1989), 1:179.

9 Abu 'l-Ḥasan Aḥmad b. ʿUmayr al-Dimashqī (d. 320/932), popularly known as Ibn Jawṣā', was the most important transmitter of his day in Damascus; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 15:15–21.

5. Elevation derived from earliness of audition: we were informed from the expert Muḥammad b. Nāṣir that the expert Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir<sup>10</sup> said, “Priority of audition is part of elevation.” Much of this comes under the previously mentioned category, but there are some aspects that do not and indeed they distinguish it. For instance, two people hear a ḥadīth from a single teacher. The audition of one of them was, let us say, sixty years ago and the audition of the other forty years ago. When the isnāds up to the two people contain the same number of transmitters, the isnād to the first – the one whose audition was earlier – is more elevated.

These are the types of elevation fully explained and satisfactorily clarified. All praise belongs to God (He is praised and exalted). (God knows best.) As for the verse of Abū Ṭāhir al-Silafī (God bless him) we heard:

Rather, among those possessing retention and exactitude  
elevation in ḥadīth consists of soundness in the isnād.

and the remark we heard from the vizier Niẓām al-Mulk,<sup>11</sup> “In my opinion the elevated ḥadīth is the one established as sound from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), even if the number of its transmitters [that is, intermediaries] reaches one hundred;” these and other statements like them do not refer to elevation as the scholars of ḥadīth commonly use the term. It is elevation only in the everyday sense of the word [that is, in the sense of “excellence”]. God knows best.

Section: Lowness (*nuzūl*) is the opposite of elevation. Each of the subcategories of elevation has as its opposite a subcategory of lowness. There are therefore five subcategories of lowness and a detailed understanding of these may be derived from the classification of the subcategories of elevation given above.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim said, “Someone may say, ‘Lowness is the opposite of elevation and whoever knows elevation also knows its opposite.’ It is not so. Lowness has levels known only to the students of this discipline,” and so forth.<sup>12</sup> This does not refute the claim that lowness is the opposite of elevation in the way I mentioned. Rather, it is a refutation of the claim that lowness may be known through knowledge

<sup>10</sup> Abu ‘l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdīsī (448/1056–507/1113), known as Ibn al-Qaysarānī, was an expert in Sufism and ḥadīth and wrote several works; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:361–71.

<sup>11</sup> The Saljukid vizier Abū ‘Alī al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī al-Ṭūsī, known as Niẓām al-Mulk, was born in a village near Ṭus in 408/1018 and is best known for the colleges he founded to teach Shāfi‘īte law and Ash‘arite theology in Baghdad and other cities. He was assassinated in 485/1092; *EP*, 8:69–73.

<sup>12</sup> *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 12.

of elevation. That warning is appropriate for what *he* mentioned regarding elevation, for he was brief in his explanation and short on details. That is not the case regarding what *we* said about elevation, because ours is a detailed explication which also clarifies the levels of lowness. Knowledge belongs to God (He is blessed and exalted).

Lowness is inferior and undesirable. Superiority belongs to elevation, as was explained and demonstrated above. Ibn Khallād related that one insightful person said, “Being low (*tanazzul*) in an isnād is best,”<sup>13</sup> and he gave as proof an argument to the effect that personal exertion and study are needed to accredit and discredit each transmitter. When the number of intermediaries increases, the exertion is greater and the reward is therefore greater. This is a weak doctrine, weakly supported. Indeed, we heard that ‘Ali b. al-Madīnī and Abū ‘Amr al-Mustamīl al-Nisābūrī<sup>14</sup> said, “Lowness is a calamity.” This and similar statements condemning lowness are directed at certain aspects of lowness. However, when lowness is specified instead of elevation as a means to obtain a benefit superior to the benefit of elevation, it is to be preferred and is not to be scorned. God knows best.

13 *Muḥaddith al-fāṣil*, 216.

14 In addition to being a repetitor, Abū ‘Amr Ahmad b. al-Mubārak al-Nisābūrī taught ḥadīth on his own. He died in Nishapur in 284/897; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:373–5.

Category 30  
FAMOUS ḤADITH  
(*Ma‘rifat al-mashhūr min al-ḥadīth*)

---

The meaning of the word “fame” (*shuhra*) is commonly understood. Famous ḥadīth fall into the subcategories of sound – for instance the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “Actions are judged by intentions,” and the like – and unsound – like the ḥadīth, “Seeking knowledge is a duty incumbent upon every Muslim.”

Likewise, we read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “There are four ḥadīth from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) circulating in the marketplaces which have no authenticity, ‘Whoever gives me the glad tidings of the departure of the month of Ādhār I will give glad tidings of heaven,’ ‘On the Day of Resurrection, I will be the enemy of whoever harms a protected non-Muslim,’ ‘Your sacrifice is the day of your fast,’ and ‘The supplicant has a right [to alms], even if he comes riding on a horse.’”

Alternatively, famous ḥadīth fall into the subcategories of the ḥadīth famous among the scholars of ḥadīth and others – for instance the statement of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “A Muslim is someone from whose tongue and hand other Muslims are safe,” and the like – and the ḥadīth famous exclusively among the scholars of ḥadīth and no one else – like the ḥadīth we heard from Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī<sup>1</sup> from Sulaymān al-Taymī<sup>2</sup> from Abū Mijlaz<sup>3</sup> from Anas [b. Mālik] to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) made a personal prayer (*qunūt*) after the inclinations (*rukū’*) for a month, invoking curses on the tribes of Rīl and Dhakwān. This ḥadīth is famous among the scholars of ḥadīth and included in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*.<sup>4</sup> Other transmitters beside Abū Mijlaz transmitted it from Anas; others beside Taymī transmitted it from Abū Mijlaz; others beside Anṣārī transmitted it from Taymī. Only the practitioners of the craft know that. Others sometimes consider it unusual because

---

1 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī (118/736–215/830) served as a judge in al-Baṣra and Baghdad. The famous collection of elevated ḥadīth known as *Juz’ al-Anṣārī* goes back to him; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:532–8.

2 Abu ‘l-Muqtamir Sulaymān b. Ṭirkhān al-Taymī was a pious and well-respected transmitter of ḥadīth who died in al-Baṣra in 143/761; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:285–6.

3 According to Bukhārī, Abū Mijlaz Lāhiq b. Ḥamid (or Ḥumayd) al-Sadūsī al-Baṣrī died shortly before 100/728; *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):258–9; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):124.

4 Ḥadīth to this effect are in fact found in both Bukhārī, *Kitāb al-Ǧāmi‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 1:254 (K. al-Witr, B. al-Qunūt qabl al-rukū’ wa-ba’dahū) and Muslim, *al-Ǧāmi‘ al-ṣaḥīḥ*, 2:136 (K. al-Ṣalāh).

Taymī [normally] relates directly from Anas while here he relates from Anas through an intermediary.

One kind of famous ḥadīth is the “widespread,”<sup>5</sup> which the scholars of practical and theoretical law mention. The scholars of ḥadīth do not give it a special name indicating its particular meaning. Although the expert al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī did mention it, there are indications in what he said which show that he was not following the scholars of ḥadīth in doing so.<sup>6</sup> That may be because [the concept] is something which their craft does not include and [ḥadīth of this type] are rarely found in their relations. The widespread ḥadīth consists of a report conveyed by transmitters knowledge of whose veracity reaches the level of incontrovertibility (*darūra*).<sup>7</sup> This condition must be met continuously in its transmitters from the beginning of its isnād to its end.

Anyone asked to produce an example of a widespread ḥadīth from among the ḥadīth in circulation will be severely taxed by its requirements. For instance, the ḥadīth, “Acts are judged by intentions,” is not by any means of that kind, even if it is transmitted by more than the number of individuals required to meet the standard for being widespread (*tawāṭir*). This is because the required number of transmitters occurs in the middle of its isnād and it is not found in its early stages in the fashion discussed above. To be sure, we do view as an example of that the ḥadīth, “Whoever deliberately ascribes a lie to me, let him find a seat for himself in hell.”<sup>8</sup> Many Companions (God be pleased with them) convey it and in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs* it is related from a number of them. The exalted expert Abū Bakr al-Bazzār in his *Musnād* stated that around forty of the Companions related it from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). One of the ḥadīth experts<sup>9</sup> said that sixty-two Companions related it from the Messenger of God

5 *Mutawāṭir*: traditionally, the principal feature of this kind of ḥadīth was that its transmitters were so numerous in each generation that under normal circumstances it would have been impossible for all of them to enter into a conspiracy to put a lie in circulation; see, for instance, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kifāya*, 16; Ibn Ḥajar, *Nuzhat al-naẓar*, 9–17. Edward E. Salisbury translated “*mutawāṭir*” as “reiterated” (“Contributions from original sources to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 7 [1862]:103) and Marçais followed him with “répété” (*Tagrib*, 201). A more literal translation would be “consecutive,” although that does not accord well with the common understanding of the term. This may suggest that its original sense was close to that of *muttaṣil* and *mawṣil*.

6 It is true that the discussion he presents in *Kifāya* (pp. 16–18) owes a good deal to the early opponents of the *ashāb al-ḥadīth*.

7 This would seem to be the only possible meaning of this sentence, and Nawawī (*Tagrib*, 41) understood it this way. However, other scholars stressed that knowledge of the veracity of the ḥadīth – rather than of its transmitters – was what was obtained through *tawāṭir*; e.g., al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Kifāya*, 16.

8 For a detailed study of this ḥadīth and its lines of transmission, see G.H.A. Juynboll, *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of early ḥadīth* (Cambridge, 1983), 108–33.

9 Abu ’l-Faraj b. al-Jawzī said that *sixty-one* Companions transmitted this ḥadīth from the Prophet; *Kitāb al-Mawdū’at*, 1:56.

(Peace be upon him), including the Ten to whom the Prophet bore witness of their entrance into Paradise. This expert said, "This is the only ḥadīth the transmitters of ḥadīth have in the world which all of the Ten transmit and the sole ḥadīth known to have been related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) by more than sixty Companions." Some scholars of ḥadīth count even more Companions than that – even a fraction of this constitutes the number required for widespreadness – and the number of its transmitters increased continually from then on with each successive level of transmission. God knows best.

Category 31  
RARE AND SCARCE ḤADĪTH

(Ma'rifat al-gharib wa-'l-aziz min al-ḥadīth)

---

We heard that the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Manda al-İsbahānī said, “The rare ḥadīth is like those of Zuhrī, Qatāda and the other authorities whose ḥadīth are collected. When a single transmitter is alone in relating a particular ḥadīth from them, it is called ‘rare.’ When two or three transmitters relate from them and they all have a single ḥadīth, it is called ‘scarce.’ When a group relates a ḥadīth from them, it is called ‘famous’ (*mashhūr*).” The ḥadīth which one transmitter (*ba'd al-ruwāt*) is alone in transmitting is described as “rare.” The same is true for the ḥadīth which one of them is alone in transmitting with features, whether in its text or in its isnād, which others do not give. Not everything that is considered isolated (*min anwāt al-afrād*) is considered rare, this being the case with the isolated ḥadīth ascribed to certain lands discussed above.

Rare ḥadīth are divided into the subcategories of sound – for instance, the isolated ḥadīth included in the *Sahīh* – and unsound, and these predominate among the rare ḥadīth. We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said more than once, “Do not write down these rare ḥadīth. They are rejected (*manākir*<sup>1</sup>) and the generality of them are from weak transmitters.”

The rare ḥadīth can also be subcategorized in another way. Some are rare in regard to both the text and the isnād. This is the ḥadīth the text of which a single transmitter is alone in transmitting. Some are rare in regard to the isnād, but not the text; for instance, a ḥadīth the text of which is well known and related from a group of Companions. When someone is alone in relating it from another Companion, it is rare in regard to that line of transmission, although its text is not rare. Of that type are the sound texts which the great teachers have with rare isnāds. This is the kind Tirmidhī calls “rare in regard to this line of transmission” (*gharib min hādha 'l-wajh*).

I do not think that the reverse of this type can exist. There is therefore nothing rare in respect to the text and not rare in respect to its isnād, except when an isolated ḥadīth is famous from someone who was alone in transmitting it and a large number of students then related it from him. So it becomes a famous rare ḥadīth (*gharib mashhūr*), rare in respect to its text and not rare in respect to its isnād – rather in regard to one of the two ends of its isnād. This is because its isnād is characterized by rarity in its beginning and by fame in its other end, like the ḥadīth, “Acts are judged by intentions,” and the rest of the rare ḥadīth which the famous compositions contain. God knows best.

---

1 See above, p. 55.

Category 32  
RARE WORDS IN THE ḤADĪTH  
(*Ma‘rifat gharīb al-ḥadīth*)

---

Rare words in the ḥadīth consist of words that occur in the texts of some ḥadīth which are obscure and difficult to understand because they are rarely used. This is an important discipline, ignorance of which is shameful for students of ḥadīth in particular and scholars in general. Immersion in it is no light matter and those who would undertake it should investigate scrupulously and proceed with care.

We heard from Maymūnī<sup>1</sup> that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was asked about one of the rare words of the ḥadīth. He said, “Ask the experts in rare words. I dislike discussing the utterances of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) supposititiously for fear that I will make a mistake.” We read that Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ta’rīkhi<sup>2</sup> said, Abū Qilāba ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad<sup>3</sup> transmitted to me. He said, “I said to Aṣma‘ī, ‘Abū Sa‘id, what is the meaning of the statement of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), ‘The neighbor has a greater right to his *sabaq*’?” He said, ‘I do not comment on the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). However, the ancient Arabs assert that *sabaq* is the same as *laziq* [that is, the adjacent property].’”

Scholars have composed excellent books on this subject. We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim said, “The first in the history of Islam to compose a work on rare words was al-Naḍr b. Shumayl.”<sup>4</sup> Some disagreed with him and said, “The first to compose a book on this subject was Abū ‘Ubayda Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā.”<sup>5</sup> Both of their books are short. Later, Abū ‘Ubayd al-Qāsim b. Sallām composed his famous book. He brought the material together and thoroughly examined it in an excellent fashion and so attained an exalted reputation among scholars and became a model in this matter. Qutaybī then tracked down the material Abū ‘Ubayd missed and composed his famous book

---

<sup>1</sup> Abu ‘l-Ḥasan ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Hamīd al-Maymūnī (d. 274/887) was a student of the imām Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and acted as *muftī* in the city of al-Raqqā; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:89–90.

<sup>2</sup> Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Sarrāj was a third/ninth-century litterateur who was called “Ta’rīkhi” because of his interest in dates; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rīkh Baghdaḍ*, 2:348.

<sup>3</sup> Abū Qilāba ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Raqāshi (190/806–276/890) was a mistake-prone ḥadīth transmitter from al-Baṣra; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:177–9.

<sup>4</sup> *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 88.

<sup>5</sup> The philologist Abū ‘Ubayda Ma‘mar b. al-Muthannā (10/728–ca. 210/825) wrote a number of important books. The work referred to here was entitled *Gharib al-ḥadīth*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:67–71.

on the subject.<sup>6</sup> Then Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī tracked down what they both missed and wrote his famous book on this matter.<sup>7</sup> These three books are the principal works composed on the subject. After them, other compilations appeared which contain many additions and useful remarks on the subject. However, these are not to be accepted unquestioningly unless their authors were exalted authorities.

In explicating the rare words in ḥadīth, the greatest reliance should be placed upon what is explicated in one of the relations of the ḥadīth.

For instance, it was related in the ḥadīth of Ibn Ṣayyād<sup>8</sup> that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to him, “I have hidden a secret for you. What is it?” and Ibn Ṣayyād replied, “The *dukhkh*.” The meaning of the word is obscure and problematic and many have explicated it incorrectly. In al-Ḥākim’s *Ma’rifat ‘ulūm al-ḥadīth*,<sup>9</sup> we read that it is *dakhkh* with the sense of *zakhkh*, which is sexual intercourse. This is an egregious mix-up which exasperates both the scholar and the ordinary believer. Rather, the sense of the ḥadīth is that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said to him, “I have concealed a hidden thing for you. What is it?” and he replied, “The *dukhkh*,” meaning “smoke” (*dukhān*). *Dukhkh* means “smoke” in one Arabic dialect since one of the versions of the ḥadīth contains something specifying that. The Messenger of God said, “I have hidden a secret for you,” and he hid for him “a day the sky will be filled with visible smoke,”<sup>10</sup> and Ibn Ṣayyād said, “It is the *dukhkh*.” Then the Messenger of God said, “Scram! You will never exceed your capacity.” This ḥadīth is well established and sound. Tirmidhī and others included it in their ḥadīth collections. In accordance with the custom of the soothsayers of wresting only part of a thing from the devils, Ibn Ṣayyād took from [the verse of the Qur’ān] this word alone, without understanding the whole statement. For that reason, the Prophet said to him, “Scram! You will never exceed your capacity,” meaning: You have no more capacity to understand than the soothsayers. God knows best.

6 This is a reference to Ibn Qutayba’s *Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth* (ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jubūrī, Baghdad, 1977).

7 Khaṭṭābī’s *Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth* has survived in several manuscripts; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:211.

8 The primary question regarding Ṣaf b. Ṣayyād (or Ibn Ṣā’id) was whether he was the antichrist. See Muslim, *al-Jāmi’ al-ṣahīh*, 8:189–94 (K. al-Fitan); Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, *Kitāb al-Sunan*, 4 vols, ed. Muḥammad Muhyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut, n.d.), 4:120–1 (K. al-Malahim, B. Khabar Ibn Ṣā’id).

9 This passage does not appear in the text of the Cairo edition of al-Ḥākim’s book. See the comments of Prof. ‘Abd al-Rahmān in *Mugaddima*, 460, n. 2.

10 Qur’ān 44:10.

Category 33  
ENCHAINED HADITH  
*(Ma'rifat al-musalsal min al-hadith)*

---

Enchainment (*tasalsul*) is one of the attributes of isnāds and consists of the consecutive succession of the transmitters of the isnād and their common adherence, one after another, to a single state or condition. It is subcategorized into enchainment in the manner of relating and taking up the ḥadīth and enchainment in regard to the state and condition of the transmitters. Taking into consideration words, actions and the like, the states and conditions of transmitters can be divided into innumerable subcategories for that purpose. The expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim listed eight types.<sup>1</sup> However, the instances he mentioned are only eight basic forms or examples. They cannot, as we have said, be limited to eight.<sup>2</sup>

An example of enchainment in regard to the manner of relating and taking up the ḥadīth is the isnād which is enchainied with "I heard X say, 'I heard Y say,'" to the end of the isnād; or with "He transmitted to us" – or "He informed us" – to its end; or with "X, by God, informed us. He said, 'Y, by God, informed us,'" to its end.<sup>3</sup> An example of enchainment in reference to the states of the transmitters, their words and the like, is the isnād of the ḥadīth, "God, make me remember to thank you, think of you and worship you well," enchainied with the transmitters saying, "I love you, so say, ['God, make me remember ...']."<sup>4</sup> Another example is the ḥadīth of joining hands<sup>5</sup> and the ḥadīth of counting on the fingers.<sup>6</sup> We relate several things similar to that and many are in circulation. The best of them are those containing an indication of the continuity of audition and the lack of misrepresentation. One of the special merits of enchainment is that it implies a greater precision on the part of the transmitters.

Rarely are the enchainied ḥadīth totally free from weakness, I mean, in respect to the enchainment, not the authenticity of the text. In some enchainied ḥadīth, the enchainment is interrupted in the middle of the isnād and that is a defect in it. This is the case with the ḥadīth enchainied with, "[This is] the first ḥadīth I heard [from X],"<sup>7</sup> according to the correct view on the subject. God knows best.

---

1 *'Ulūm al-hadīth*, 29–34.

2 This sentence is missing from the edition of Prof. 'Abd al-Rahmān.

3 See, for example, Muḥammad 'Abd al-Bāqī al-Ayyūbī, *al-Manāhil al-salsala fi 'l-ahādīth al-musalsala* (Beirut, 1403/1983), 182.

4 Ayyūbī, *Manāhil*, 24–7.

5 Ayyūbī, *Manāhil*, 58–62.

6 Ayyūbī, *Manāhil*, 63–5.

7 Ayyūbī, *Manāhil*, 6–11.

Category 34

ABROGATING AND ABROGATED ḤADĪTH

(Ma‘rifat nāsikh al-ḥadīth wa-mansūkhīhi)

---

This discipline is important and regarded as difficult. We heard that Zuhri (God be pleased with him) said, “It wears out legal scholars and makes it impossible for them to distinguish the abrogating ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from the abrogated.” Shāfi‘ī (God be pleased with him) had great influence and precedence in this subject. We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said to Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Wāra<sup>1</sup> – one of the authorities in ḥadīth – as soon as the latter arrived<sup>2</sup> from Egypt, “Did you copy the books of Shāfi‘ī?” He said no. Ibn Ḥanbal replied, “You were remiss. We did not learn to distinguish the general from the particular, or the abrogating ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) from the abrogated until we studied with Shāfi‘ī.” Some of the scholars of ḥadīth who have occupied themselves with this discipline have included in it what does not properly belong, because of the obscurity of the meaning of abrogation and what constitutes it. It consists of the Legislator [that is, the Prophet Muḥammad] abolishing an early ruling of his with a later ruling from him. This is a definition I came across which is free from some of the objections that are lodged against others.

The abrogating and abrogated ḥadīth fall into various subcategories. One of these consists of the instances of abrogation recognized through an explicit declaration from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). An example of this is the ḥadīth of Burayda<sup>3</sup> in Muslim’s *Sahīh*<sup>4</sup> in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “I had forbidden you to visit graves. Visit them!” and similar instances.

Another kind consists of the instances of abrogation recognized on the basis of a statement of a Companion. Examples of this are the ḥadīth which Tirmidhī<sup>5</sup> and others related in which Ubayy b. Ka'b (God be pleased with him) said, “The major ablution was optional in the case of a seminal emission in the beginning of Islam and then the option was forbidden;” and the ḥadīth Nasā'i<sup>6</sup> included in which Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh said, “The last of the two orders from the Messenger

---

1 Ibn Wāra (d. 270/884) was one of the great critics of ḥadīth in the city of al-Rayy; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:28–32.

2 Presumably in Baghdad.

3 Burayda b. al-Huṣayb al-Aslāmī (d. ca. 62/682) was a Companion who transmitted about one hundred and fifty ḥadīth from the Prophet; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:469–71.

4 *Al-Jāmi‘ al-sahīh*, 3:65 (K. al-Janā‘iz).

5 *Sahīh al-Tirmidhī*, 1:124 (K. al-Tahāra, B. Mā ja‘a fi anna al-mā min al-mā).

6 *Sunan al-Nasā'i*, 13 vols (Cairo, 1350/1931–1352/1934) 1:199–200 (K. al-Tahāra).

of God (Peace be upon him) was abandoning the ablution for what is touched by fire." There are other similar instances.

Another subcategory consists of the instances of abrogation recognized by dates. This is the case with the ḥadīth of Shaddād b. Aws and others in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, "The copper and the cupped break their fast," and the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās depicting the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) being cupped while fasting. Shāfi‘ī explained that the second ḥadīth abrogated the first, because it is related in the ḥadīth of Shaddād that he was with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) at the time of the conquest of Mecca. The Prophet saw a man being cupped in the month of Ramadan and said, "The copper and the cupped break their fast." It was related in the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās that the Prophet (Peace be upon him) was cupped while he was in the state of ritual consecration for entering the precincts of Mecca (*muḥrim*) and fasting. It thereby became clear that the first ḥadīth was from the time of the conquest in year 8 [629 AD] and the second was during the Farewell Pilgrimage in year 10.

Another subcategory consists of the instances of abrogation made known through consensus. An example is the ḥadīth prescribing the execution of the wine drinker for his fourth offense. [The ruling in this ḥadīth] is abrogated and its abrogation became known through the achievement of a consensus on the abandonment of the practice. Consensus [by itself] may neither abrogate nor be abrogated. However, it does indicate the existence of another agency of abrogation. God knows best what is correct.

## Category 35

### MISREADINGS IN THE ISNĀDS AND TEXTS OF HADĪTH

(*Ma‘rifat al-muṣahḥaf min asānīd al-ahādīth wa-mutūnihā*)

This is a noble discipline which only the most skillful experts undertake. Dāraqutnī is one of them and he has a useful book on it.<sup>1</sup> We heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Who is safe from error and misreading?”

An example of misreading in an isnād is the ḥadīth of Shu‘ba from al-‘Awwām b. Murājim<sup>2</sup> from Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī<sup>3</sup> from ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Convey rights to those who deserve them, and so forth.” Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn misread it and said, “Ibn Muzāḥīm,” and he was refuted. It is really “Ibn Murājim.” Another example is what we heard from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. He said, Muḥammad b. Ja‘far [that is, “Ghundar”] informed us. He said, Shu‘ba transmitted to us from “Mālik b. ‘Urfuṭa” from ‘Abd Khayr<sup>4</sup> from ‘Ā’ishah, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) forbade the gourd and skin smeared with pitch.” Aḥmad said, “Shu‘ba misread it. ‘Mālik b. ‘Urfuṭa’ is supposed to be Khālid b. ‘Alqama.”<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Zā’ida b. Qudāma and others have related it in accordance with what Aḥmad said. We read from Dāraqutnī that Ibn Jarir al-Ṭabarī said, “Among the members of the Banū Sulaym who related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) is ‘Utba b. al-Budhdhar,’” and he related a ḥadīth of his. The name is supposed to be Ibn al-Nuddar.<sup>6</sup>

An example of misreading in a text is the ḥadīth Ibn Lahi‘a related from the letter of Mūsā b. ‘Uqbā<sup>7</sup> to him, with the latter’s isnād, from Zayd b. Thābit that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) *ihtajama* (was cupped) in the mosque. Instead, it should read: “He *ihtajara* (made an enclosure) in the mosque,” with a shanty or a mat, in which he prayed. Ibn Lahi‘a misread it because he had taken it from a written source [that is, the letter of Mūsā b. ‘Uqbā] without audition. Muslim mentioned this in his *Kitāb al-Tamyiz*.<sup>8</sup>

1 This apparently is a reference to Dāraqutnī’s now-lost *Kitāb taṣhīf al-muḥaddithin* mentioned in Ibn Khayr al-Ishbili, *Fihrist mā rawāhu ‘an shuyūkhīhi*, 2nd edn (Cairo, 1382/1963), 204.

2 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabīr*, 4(1):66–7; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):22.

3 Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mull (the vocalization of “Mull” is variously given) al-Nahdī was a Follower who died in 100/719; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:175–8.

4 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabīr*, 3(2):133–4; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):37–8.

5 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabīr*, 2(1):173; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):343.

6 ‘Utba b. al-Nuddar al-Shāmī was a Companion who died in 84/703; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:417.

7 Abū Muḥammad Mūsā b. ‘Uqbā (d. 141/758) is best known for his *Kitāb al-Maghāzi* treating the military campaigns of the Prophet. This work has not survived intact; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:286–7. *E.I.*

8 (Riyadh, n.d.), 139–40.

[Other examples of misreading:]

We read from Dāraqutnī regarding the ḥadīth of Abū Sufyān<sup>9</sup> in which Jābir [b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Harāmī al-Anṣārī] said, “On the Day of the Parties [that is, the Battle of the Trench], *Ubayy* was wounded on the vein on the back of his hand and the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) cauterized it,” that Ghundar said in it, *abi* (my father). Rather, it is “*Ubayy* b. Ka'b.”

We also read from Dāraqutnī regarding the hadīth of Anas, “Whoever says, ‘There is no God but God,’ and has in his heart as much goodness as a *dharra* (atom) weighs will then leave hell,” that Shu‘ba said for it *dhura* (kernel of corn). This pronunciation was ascribed to misreading.

In addition, we read from Dāraqutnī regarding the hadīth of Abū Dharr,<sup>10</sup> “So you will help the *sāni‘* (skillful person),” that Hishām b. ‘Urwa pronounced it *qāsi‘i*<sup>11</sup> (poor man). It is a case of misreading. The correct form is what Zuhri related, *sāni‘*, the opposite of clumsy.

We read from Abū Zur‘a al-Rāzī that Yaḥyā b. Sallām<sup>12</sup> – he is the Qur‘ān commentator – transmitted regarding the passage from the Qur‘ān, “I will show you the abode of wrongdoers,”<sup>13</sup> from Sa‘id b. Abi ‘Aruba that Qatāda said, “That is *Miṣr*” (Egypt). Abū Zur‘a was shocked and disgusted by this. He said that in the commentary of Sa‘id from Qatāda it is *māṣirahum* (their fate).

We read from Dāraqutnī that Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-‘Anazi<sup>14</sup> transmitted the ḥadīth of the Prophet (Peace be upon him), “On the Day of Resurrection, none of you will come with a lowing cow,” and he said in it, “or a sheep which *tan‘aru* (grunts).” It is supposed to be *tay‘aru* (bleats).

We also read from Dāraqutnī that ‘Anazi said to them one day, “We are a people who possess nobility. We belong to the tribe of ‘Anaza. The Prophet (Peace be upon him) prayed toward us,” having in mind what was related regarding the Prophet (Peace be upon him) praying toward

9 Abū Sufyān Ṭalḥa b. Nafī‘ al-Iskāf was a Follower who claimed to have spent several months with Jābir in Mecca; Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 5:293–4.

10 Abū Dharr Jundub b. Junāda (his *ism* and *nasab* are disputed) al-Ghifārī (d. 32/653) was a Companion and prominent transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 2:46–78.

11 According to al-Qādi Iyād, this is the form which Ibn ‘Urwa misread; *Mashāriq al-anwār ‘alā sahiḥ al-āthār*, 2 vols (Beirut, n.d.), 2:47.

12 Abū Zakariya Yaḥyā b. Sallām al-Taymī (124/742–200/815) was a well-traveled scholar best known for his knowledge of the Qur‘ān; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:39.

13 7:145.

14 Abū Mūsā Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā al-‘Anazi (167/783–252/866) was a respected scholar of ḥadīth in al-Baṣra; Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 12:123–6.

an ‘anaza. He mistakenly believed that he prayed toward their tribe. The ‘anaza here is a spear which was stuck in the earth in front of him and which he prayed toward.<sup>15</sup>

More humorous than that is what we heard from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim<sup>16</sup> regarding a Bedouin who claimed that when the Prophet (Peace be upon him) prayed, a sheep – that is, an ‘anza – was set in front of him. That is, the Bedouin misread ‘anaza (spear) by not pronouncing the letter *nūn* with a vowel.

We also read from Dāraqutnī that Abū Bakr al-Ṣūlī<sup>17</sup> dictated in the congregational mosque<sup>18</sup> the ḥadīth of Abū Ayyūb,<sup>19</sup> “Whoever fasts the month of Ramadan and follows it for *sitt* (six [days]) from the month of Shawwāl,” and said *shay'* (some).

In addition, we read from him that the authority Abū Bakr al-Ismā‘īlī – according to what they read about him – used to say in the ḥadīth of ‘A‘ishah from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) regarding the soothsayers, “the pouring out (*qarr*) of a *zujjāja* (glass bottle),” and it should be, “[the cackling] of a *dajjāja* (hen).”<sup>20</sup>

We also read in regard to the ḥadīth related from Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān,<sup>21</sup> “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) cursed those who carefully enunciate their sermons (*yushaqiqūna al-khuṭab*) in the manner of poetry,” that Dāraqutnī said that on one occasion Waki‘ [b. al-Jarrāḥ] pronounced *khuṭab* as *haṭab* [that is, making the phrase mean “those who split firewood”]. Abū Nu‘aym [al-Fadl b. Dukayn] was present and he repeated it to Waki‘ with *khuṭab*. I read in the handwriting of one author that in the Mosque of al-Manṣūr in Baghdad Ibn Shāhīn<sup>22</sup> said

15 In examining these alleged misreadings, we should heed the warning of Prof. Rosenthal, “Strange cases of *taṣhīf* were invented in order to entertain the reader or to warn him of possible pitfalls”; *Technique*, 24.

16 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 148–9.

17 Abū Bakr Muhammad b. Yaḥyā al-Ṣūlī (d. 335/946) was a historian and litterateur with a dominating interest in poetry. A number of his works have survived and been published; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:330–31.

18 This would seem to be a reference to the Mosque of al-Manṣūr in Baghdad.

19 The Companion Abū Ayyūb Khālid b. Zayd al-Anṣārī died around the year 50/670; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:402–13.

20 The question is not as simple as the author represents it. See Bukhārī, *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣahīh*, (K. al-Adab, B. Qawl al-rajul li-‘l-shay' laysa bi-‘l-shay') and (K. al-Tibb, B. al-Kahāna).

21 Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān was a Companion of the Prophet and the founder of the Umayyad dynasty. He ruled in Damascus from 41/661 until 60/680; *EP*, 7:263–9.

22 Abū Hafṣ ‘Umar b. Alīmad (297/909–385/995), known as Ibn Shāhīn, was the author of a number of important works in the field of ḥadīth, Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:209–10.

regarding that ḥadīth, “The Prophet (Peace be upon him) prohibited the splitting of firewood,” and one wit said, “Folks, what will we do when this is necessary?”

Instances of misreading fall into two subcategories. The first of them is misreading in the text and the second in the isnād. Alternatively, they fall into two other subcategories. One is visual misreading (*taṣḥif al-baṣar*) – like the ḥadīth cited above from Ibn Lahi'a – and this is more common, and the second is aural “misreading” (*taṣḥif al-sam'*), as was the case in the hadīth of 'Āsim al-Aḥwal. One person related it, saying, “from Wāṣil al-Aḥdab.” Dāraqūṭnī said that this is a case of aural, and not visual, misreading. It seems that he maintained – and God knows best – that aural misreading refers to words which are not written similarly. Rather, the sense of hearing of the person who related it caused the mistake. By a third subdivision, misreading falls into the subcategories of misreading of the wording, and it is the more common, and “misreading” pertaining to the sense, not the wording, as was the case with the ḥadīth cited above from Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā on the praying toward an ‘*anaza*.<sup>23</sup> Calling some of what we mentioned “misreading” is figurative. (God knows best) For much of the misreading transmitted from the greatest of the splendid scholars, there are excuses which those transmitting the misreading did not pass on. We ask God for success and protection. God knows best.

---

<sup>23</sup> That is, ‘*anaza* was the correct word, but Abū Mūsā al-‘Anazi chose the wrong meaning of it.

**Category 36**  
**CONTRADICTORY HADITH**  
**(*Ma'rifat mukhtalif al-hadith*)**

---

Only the authorities who bring together the the crafts of ḥadīth and positive law and profoundly study the subtle shades of meaning of different ḥadīth can completely master the study of contradictory ḥadīth. Note that the ḥadīth mentioned in this chapter fall into two subcategories.

1. It is possible to combine the two ḥadīth and it is not impossible to bring out some aspect which removes their mutual negation: in that case, it is obligatory to direct one's attention to that aspect and endorse both of the ḥadīth. An example of this is the ḥadīth, "There is no contagion nor evil fortune," along with the two ḥadīth, "The owner of sick camels should not take his camels for watering where the owner of well camels is present," and, "Flee from a leper as you would from a lion." The two [views on contagion; that is, the one represented in the first ḥadīth and the one in the second and third ḥadīth] may be combined because these illnesses are not by their nature infectious, but God (He is blessed and exalted) made a person sick with these illnesses coming into contact with a well person a means of infecting the well person with his sickness. Sometimes this fails to cause the sickness, as is the case with the rest of the causes. In the first ḥadīth, the Prophet (Peace be upon him) refuted the belief of the ignorant that illness is contagious by nature and for that reason he said, "Who infected the first person [to have the disease]?" In the second [that is, the latter two ḥadīth] note that God (He is praised) made contact a means of infection and warned of the harm which is likely to take place through the action of God (He is praised and exalted) where the illness occurs. Of this there are many examples in the ḥadīth.

Ibn Qutayba's *Kitāb Mukhtalif al-hadīth*<sup>1</sup> (*Book of Contradictory Hadīth*) treats this topic. Although in a certain respect he has done a good job, he handled poorly other things which he was not up to. Others produced better and stronger works.

We heard that the authority [Abū Bakr] Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Khuzayma said, "I am not aware that two [genuinely] antithetical (*mutadāddayn*) ḥadīth with sound isnāds were related from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). Whoever has [seemingly contradictory ḥadīth], let him bring them to me for me to harmonize.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ta'wil mukhtalif al-hadīth*, ed. Muḥammad Zuhri al-Najjār (Cairo, 1386/1966); trans. Gérard Lecomte, *Le Traité des divergences du hadīt d'Ibn Qutayba* (Damascus, 1962).

2. The ḥadīth are so antithetical that they cannot be combined: that takes two forms: (a). it appears that one of the ḥadīth is abrogating and the other is abrogated. The abrogating one is acted upon and the abrogated is ignored. and (b). There is no indication which ḥadīth is the abrogating and which is the abrogated. Recourse is then made to determining which is to be preferred and the more preferred and better established is the one to be put into practice. The determination of preference may be made, for instance, on the basis of one of the ḥadīth having a greater number of transmitters or on the basis of the characteristics of the transmitters. There are fifty or more ways of determining preference and the task of detailing them is best left for another place. God (He is praised) knows best.

## Category 37

### ADDITIONS TO COHESIVE ISNĀDS

*(Ma'rifat al-mazid fi muttaṣil al-asānid)*

---

An example of this is the ḥadīth related from ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. He said, Sufyān informed us from ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yazid b. Jābir.<sup>1</sup> He said, Busr b. ‘Ubayd Allāh<sup>2</sup> transmitted to me. He said, I heard Abū Idrīs<sup>3</sup> saying, I heard Wāthila b. al-Asqā‘<sup>4</sup> saying, I heard Abū Marthad al-Ghanawī<sup>5</sup> saying, I heard the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saying, “Do not sit on graves and do not pray toward them.” The mention of Sufyān<sup>6</sup> in this isnād is an addition and a mistake, just as the mention of Abū Idrīs is. The mistake in mentioning Sufyān was made by someone after Ibn al-Mubārak, because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn al-Mubārak directly from Ibn Jābir himself. Some of these transmitters make explicit use of the phrase “He informed us” between them there. The mention of Abū Idrīs in the isnād is a mistake attributable to Ibn al-Mubārak. This is because a number of reliable transmitters related it from Ibn Jābir and they did not mention Abū Idrīs between Busr and Wāthila. Some of them explicitly mention there the audition of Busr from Wāthila. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī said, “They hold the opinion that Ibn al-Mubārak made a mistake in this. Busr often transmits from Abū Idrīs. Ibn al-Mubārak erred when he supposed that this was something that was related from Abū Idrīs from Wāthila. Indeed, Busr heard this ḥadīth directly from Wāthila himself.”<sup>7</sup>

The expert al-Khaṭīb has composed a book on this Category which he called *Kitāb Tamyiz al-mazid fi muttaṣil al-asānid* (*Detecting Additions in Cohesive Isnāds*). There is some doubt regarding much of what he discussed. This is because an isnād lacking the additional transmitter should be judged to contain looseness (*irsāl*), if the transmission is marked by the word “from” (*‘an*). Furthermore, with the isnād in which the additional transmitter is mentioned, the ḥadīth should be regarded as defective (*mu‘allaḥ*), in accordance with what is

---

1 Abū ‘Utba ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yazid b. Jābir (d. ca. 153/770) was a transmitter of ḥadīth in Damascus; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:176–7.

2 Very little seems to be known about the Damascene religious scholar Busr b. ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Haḍramī (d. ca. 110/728); Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:592.

3 Abū Idrīs ʻAbd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Khwālānī (d. 80/699) was a prominent figure in early Muslim Damascus; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:272–7.

4 Wāthila b. al-Asqā‘ (his *kunya* was disputed) was the last surviving Companion in Damascus. He died around 85/704; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:383–7.

5 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭikāb*, 3:1333–4.

6 In this context, it is impossible to determine whether Sufyān al-Thawrī or Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna is meant.

7 Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, *Ilal al-ḥadīth*, 2 vols (Cairo, 1343–4), 1:80.

known about the Category of the defective ḥadīth, as will be mentioned – God (He is exalted) willing – in the following Category.

If there is a clear statement of audition or informing, as in the example we gave above,<sup>8</sup> it is possible that the transmitter heard it from someone else from his [alleged] teacher and then heard it directly from the teacher himself. So it may be that Busr heard this ḥadīth from Abū Idrīs from Wāthila and then he met Wāthila and heard it directly from him. Something like this is made explicit in other instances. This applies unless an indication is found which shows that this is a mistake, along the lines of what Abū Ḥātim mentioned in the example above. The obvious course of action for someone to whom something like that has occurred would be to mention the two auditions [that is, the audition directly from the teacher and the one from an intermediary from the teacher]. When he says nothing of this kind, we interpret it as the aforementioned kind of addition. God knows best.

---

<sup>8</sup> That is, Ibn al-Mubārak is alleged to have said, “Sufyān informed us,” and Busr, “I heard Abū Idrīs saying.”

## Category 38

### HADĪTH WITH HIDDEN LOOSENESS

(*Ma'rifat al-marāsil al-khafti irsāluhā*)

---

This is an important and extremely useful Category which is mastered through collecting many ḥadīth and gathering their lines of transmission in combination with a good deal of experience. The expert al-Khaṭīb wrote *Kitāb al-Tafsīl li-mubham al-marāsil* (*Clarification of Obscure Loose Ḥadīth*) about it. Mentioned in this regard are the ḥadīth recognized as loose through the knowledge that a transmitter in the isnād did not hear or meet his alleged teacher. This is the case with the ḥadīth related from al-‘Awwām b. Hawshab<sup>1</sup> from (*an*) ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā in which he said, “When Bilāl said, ‘It is time to pray!’ the Prophet (Peace be upon him) rose and said, ‘God is great!’” It is related that Aḥmad b. Hanbal said regarding it, “Al-‘Awwām did not meet Ibn Abī Awfā.”

Another kind is the ḥadīth judged to be loose due to its appearance in another line of transmission with the addition of one individual or more in the spot where the looseness is alleged to be. An example is the ḥadīth mentioned in Category 10 from ‘Abd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] from [Sufyān] al-Thawrī from Abū Iṣhāq [Sulaymān b. Abī Sulaymān al-Shaybānī]. Interruption and looseness were judged to exist between ‘Abd al-Razzāq and Thawrī, because it is related that ‘Abd al-Razzāq said, “Al-Nu‘mān b. Abī Shayba al-Janadī transmitted to me from Thawrī from Abū Iṣhāq.” It is also judged to be loose between Thawrī and Abū Iṣhāq, because the same ḥadīth is also related from Thawrī from Sharik [b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Nakha‘ī] from Abū Iṣhāq.

This Category and the preceding one are in opposition, because each of them can be raised as an objection against the other, as was indicated above. God knows best.

---

1 Abū Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Awwām b. Hawshab b. Yazīd al-Raba‘ī died in 148/765; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:354–5.

## Category 39

### THE COMPANIONS (GOD BE PLEASED WITH ALL OF THEM) (*Ma'rifat al-Sahāba*)

---

This is a vast science on which people have written many books. If it had not been for Ibn 'Abd al-Barr's disgraceful inclusion of a large amount of material concerning the disputes that flared up between the Companions and his relations from the secular historians (*akhbāriyīn*), rather than the transmitters of ḥadīth, his *Kitāb al-Iṣṭī'āb* [*fi ma'rifat al-Asḥāb*] (*Comprehensive Book [of Companions]*) would have been one of the most pleasant and useful works on the subject. Prolixity and confusion prevail in what the secular historians relate. I will present here some useful points (God – He is exalted – willing) which the authors of the books on the Companions should have at the outset turned their attention to in the introduction to their books.

1. Scholars disagree over what constitutes a Companion (*sahābi*). The well-known practice of the adherents of ḥadīth is to regard every Muslim who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) as a Companion. Bukhārī said in his *Sahīh*, "Every Muslim who associated with (*sahiba*) the Prophet (Peace be upon him) or saw him is one of his Companions."<sup>1</sup> We read that Abu 'l-Muzaffar al-Samā'ī al-Marwazī said, "The scholars of ḥadīth apply the term 'Companion' without qualification to all of those who related from the Prophet a ḥadīth or even a single word, and they allow so much latitude in this that they count as a Companion anyone who saw the Prophet even just once. It is on account of the nobility of the status of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) that they grant Companionship to all of those who saw him." He said that the term "Companion" from the standpoint of common parlance and literal sense applies only to those who associated with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) for an extended length of time, studied extensively under him as a follower of his and took many ḥadīth from him. This is the doctrine of the experts in legal theory.

\* Indeed, we heard that Sa'id b. al-Musayyib did not regard as a Companion anyone who had not stayed with the Messenger of God' (Peace be upon him) for at least a year or two and fought with him on one or two campaigns. It seems that the meaning of this – if it is related correctly from him – refers to what is related from the legal theorists. However, there is some difficulty in his choice of expression because it necessitates that we not regard as a Companion Jarir b. 'Abd Allah

al-Bajali<sup>2</sup> and others like him who fall short of fulfilling the letter of what he stipulated, including some whose inclusion among the Companions has never to our knowledge been challenged. We heard from Shu‘ba that Mūsā al-Sabalānī<sup>3</sup> – and he was highly spoken of – said, “I went to Anas b. Mālik and said, ‘Are any of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) beside you still alive?’ He said, ‘Some Bedouins who saw him are still alive. As for those who associated with him, no.’” The isnād of the report is good and Muslim related it in the presence of Abū Zur‘a [al-Rāzī].

In some cases an individual is known to be a Companion by means of universal acknowledgement (*bi-'l-tawātur*); in some cases by numerous testimonies (*bi-'l-istifāda*) falling short of universal acknowledgement; in some cases by a few of the Companions relating that he is a Companion; and in some cases by his own statement or report – after his integrity is established – that he is a Companion. God knows best.

2. The Companions, all of them, possess the special trait that the integrity of none of them may be questioned. Rather, it is a settled matter, because of their being declared upright without qualification in texts from the Qur‘ān and the sunna and by the consensus of those who are taken into consideration in the consensus of the Community. God (He is blessed and exalted) said, “You were the best community which was brought forth to men,” and so forth.<sup>4</sup> It is said that the commentators agree that this verse refers to the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). God (He is exalted) said, “Thus, we made you a Community in the middle so you can be witnesses against the people,”<sup>5</sup> and this is speech addressed to those living at that time. He (I praise Him) also said, “Muhammad, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and those who are with him are severe against the infidels,” and so forth.<sup>6</sup> Many of the texts of the sunna also testify to that, including the ḥadīth of Abū Sa‘id [al-Khudrī] – which is agreed to be sound – that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Do not insult my Companions! By the One who holds my life in His hand, if one of you were to spend a pile of gold the size of Uhud<sup>7</sup> [on good works], he would still not attain a small measure of [the honor of] one of the Companions or even a half of that measure.” The Community agrees unanimously on declaring all of the Companions to be upright. On the basis of the consensus of those

2 Abū ‘Amr (or Abū ‘Abd Allāh) Jarir b. ‘Abd Allah al-Bajali converted to Islam only forty days prior to the death of the Prophet. He died around 50/670; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣrāf*, 1:236–40.

3 I have not been able to identify this person.

4 Qur‘ān 3:110.

5 Qur‘ān 2:143.

6 Qur‘ān 48:29.

7 Uhud is a mountain a short distance to the north of Medina where the Muslims suffered a setback at the hands of the pagan Meccans in the year 3/625; *EP*, 3:970–1.

scholars who are taken into account in determining a consensus, the same is held to be true of those who were involved in the discords (*fītan*) on account of their high esteem and the glorious deeds which were set out for them. It would seem that God (He is praised and exalted) ordained the consensus on that because they were the conveyors of the Holy Law (*al-shari'a*). God knows best.

3. The most prolific of the Companions in terms of transmitting ḥadīth from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was Abū Hurayra. That judgement was related from Sa‘īd b. Abi ‘l-Ḥasan<sup>8</sup> and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, and it is an obvious fact not hidden from any ḥadīthologist. He was the first scholar of ḥadīth (*sāhib ḥadīth*). We read that Abū Bakr b. Abi Dāwūd al-Sijistānī said, “I saw Abū Hurayra in a dream while I was in Sijistān arranging his ḥadīth. I said, ‘I love you.’ He said, ‘I was the first scholar of ḥadīth in the world.’” We also heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (God be pleased with him) said, “Six of the Companions of the Prophet (God bless him) related much from him and were granted a long life, Abū Hurayra, Ibn ‘Umar, Ā’isha, Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh, Ibn ‘Abbās and Anas. Abū Hurayra was the most prolific of them in terms of ḥadīth and reliable transmitters took ḥadīth from him.”

The most prolific of the Companions in terms of the legal *responsa* (*futuṣā*) related from him is Ibn ‘Abbās. We read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “None of the Companions of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) has more legal opinions related from him than Ibn ‘Abbās.” We also heard that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal was asked, “Who are the ‘Abd Allāhs?” and he replied, “‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abbās, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr<sup>9</sup> and ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr.” He was asked, “And Ibn Mas‘ūd?” He said, “No, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd is not one of the ‘Abd Allāhs.” The expert Ahmad al-Bayhaqī – in something that we heard from him and I read in his own handwriting – said, “That is because Ibn Mas‘ūd died early. Those others lived until their knowledge was needed. When they agree on something, it is said, ‘This is the doctrine of the ‘Abd Allāhs,’ or, ‘This is what they did.’” Ibn Mas‘ūd shares this status with the rest of the Companions named “‘Abd Allāh,” and they number about two hundred and twenty. God knows best.

We heard that ‘Ali b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Madīnī said, “Only three of the Companions of the Prophet had students who took up their doctrine in law, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd, Zayd b. Thābit and Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them).”<sup>10</sup> Each of them had students who took up his doctrine and gave legal opinions to the people. We heard that Masrūq<sup>11</sup> said, “I found that the knowledge of the

8 Sa‘īd b. Abi ‘l-Ḥasan Yasār al-Baṣrī (d. 100/719) was the brother of the famous al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:588–9.

9 Abū Khubayb ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām al-Qurashī (2/624–73/692) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He led an uprising against the Umayyads and died in the siege of Mecca; *EP*, 1:54–5.

10 *Jil*, 42.

11 Abū Ā’isha Masrūq b. al-Ajda‘ al-Hāmdānī (d. ca. 63/683) was a prominent Follower who converted to Islam during the lifetime of the Prophet; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:63–9.

Companions of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) ended up in the hands of six of them, ‘Umar, ‘Ali, Ubayy, Zayd, Abu ‘l-Dardā’ and ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd. Then the knowledge of these six went to two, ‘Ali and ‘Abd Allāh.<sup>12</sup> We heard something similar from Muṭarrif<sup>13</sup> from Sha‘bī from Maṣrūq, but he mentioned Abū Mūsā instead of Abu ‘l-Dardā’. We heard that Sha‘bī said, “Knowledge was taken from six of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). ‘Umar, ‘Abd Allāh [b. Maṣūd] and Zayd were similar in knowledge and they used to borrow from one another. The knowledge of ‘Ali, [Abū Mūsā] al-Ash‘arī and Ubayy was similar and they used to borrow from one another.”<sup>14</sup> We heard that the expert Aḥmad al-Bayhaqī said that Shāfi‘ī mentioned the Companions in the original version of his *Treatise (Risālatihi al-qadima)*, praised them appropriately and then said, “They are above us in every branch of knowledge, in personal striving (*ijtihād*), in piety, in intelligence and in any matter through which knowledge is attained and derived. To us their legal opinions are the most praiseworthy and theirs are better for us than the ones we have for ourselves.” God knows best.

4. We heard that Abū Zur‘ā al-Rāzī was asked how many people transmitted from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and said, “Who can determine that exactly? Forty thousand witnessed the Farewell Pilgrimage<sup>15</sup> with the Prophet (Peace be upon him) and seventy thousand witnessed Tabūk<sup>16</sup> with him.” We also heard that Abū Zur‘ā was asked, “Is it not said that the ḥadīth of the Prophet (Peace be upon him) number four thousand?” He said, “May God loosen the canine teeth of whoever says that! This is a doctrine of the heretics. Who can count the ḥadīth of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him)? [Through his death] the Prophet was taken from 114,000 Companions who related from him and heard ḥadīth from him” – or according to another relation, “who saw him and heard ḥadīth from him.” He was asked, “Abū Zur‘ā, Those? Where were they? Where did they hear ḥadīth from him?” He said, “The inhabitants of Medina, the inhabitants of Mecca, those living between the two cities, the Bedouin and those who witnessed the Farewell Pilgrimage with him – that is, everyone who saw him and heard ḥadīth from him at Mt. ‘Arafa.”

People differ over the number of the levels and types of Companions. For that, precedence in conversion to Islam, participation in the Emigration and witnessing the other great scenes with the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) – by our

12 ‘Ali b. al-Madīnī, *al-‘Ilal*, ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘ītī Amin Qal‘ajī (Aleppo, 1400/1980), 42.

13 Abū Bakr (or Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān) Muṭarrif b. Ṭarīf al-Kūfī (d. ca. 143/760) was a highly respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:127–8.

14 ‘Ali b. al-Madīnī, *al-‘Ilal*, 41.

15 In the year 10/632, the Prophet led the pilgrimage to Mecca and set down its rites for later generations; *EF*, 3:33.

16 In the year 9/630 Muḥammad led an expedition from Medina to the town Tabūk to subdue the local Arab tribes; *EF*, 10:50–1.

fathers, mothers and ourselves he (Peace be upon him) is the Messenger of God! – are taken into consideration. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim put them into twelve ranks<sup>17</sup> and others have added more. We will not take the time to set that out in detail.

5. The best of the Companions in absolute terms was Abū Bakr followed by ‘Umar. At this point, the majority of the forebears put ‘Uthmān before ‘Ali. The Sunnite inhabitants of al-Kūfa gave ‘Ali precedence over ‘Uthmān. A number held this doctrine, including Sufyān al-Thawrī at first. He then went back to granting precedence to ‘Uthmān. Khaṭṭābī related that from Sufyān al-Thawrī and from the other Sunnites of al-Kūfa. [Abū Bakr] Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Khuzayma is one of the adherents of ḥadīth who was reported to have given ‘Ali precedence over ‘Uthmān. The doctrines of the scholars of ḥadīth and the Sunnites have settled on granting precedence to ‘Uthmān.

In regard to the best Companions as a type, Abū Manṣūr [‘Abd al-Qāhir b. Tāhir] al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī said, “Our teachers unanimously agreed that the best of them were the four Caliphs,<sup>18</sup> then the remaining six who make up the Ten [who were granted the glad tidings that they would enter Paradise], then the Muslims present at the battle of Badr,<sup>19</sup> then those who participated in the battle of Uhud, then those who took the Pledge of Good Pleasure at al-Hudaybiya.” In the text of the Qur’ān, preference was granted to “the first Muhājirs and Ansarites having precedence.”<sup>20</sup> According to the statement of Sa‘id al-Musayyib and certain others, the people referred to in the verse were those who prayed to the two *qiblas*.<sup>21</sup> According to the statement of Sha‘bī they were the Companions who witnessed the Pledge of Good Pleasure. It is reported that Muḥammad b. Ka‘b al-Quraṣī<sup>22</sup> and ‘Aṭā’ b. Yasār<sup>23</sup> said they were the participants in the battle of Badr. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr related that from them in something I found from him.<sup>24</sup> God knows best.

6. The forebears disagreed over who was the first of the Companions to convert to Islam. Some said Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, and this was related from Ibn ‘Abbās,

17 ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 22–5.

18 That is, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Ali.

19 In the year 2/624 the Muslims under Muḥammad defeated a much larger force of pagan Meccans; *EF*, 1:867–8.

20 This is a reference to Qur’ān, 9:100.

21 The *qibla* is the direction to which Muslims orient themselves during their prayers. They originally prayed toward Jerusalem and in the year 2/623 were enjoined to pray in the direction of Mecca; *EF*, 5:82–3.

22 Muḥammad b. Ka‘b b. Sulaym al-Quraṣī was an expert commentator on the Qur’ān who died surrounded by his students in an earthquake around the year 120/738; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:32.

23 ‘Aṭā’ b. Yasār, the brother of Sulaymān, died around 100/719; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:448–9.

24 *Iṣrāfīl*, 1:14.

Hassān b. Thābit,<sup>25</sup> Ibrāhim al-Nakha‘ī and others. Some said that ‘Ali was the first to convert to Islam, and this was related from Zayd b. Arqam,<sup>26</sup> Abū Dharr [al-Ghifārī], al-Miqdād<sup>27</sup> and others. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim said, “I know of no disagreement among the writers of histories (*ashāb al-tawārikh*) that ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib was the first of them to convert to Islam.”<sup>28</sup> That is to be rejected from al-Hākim. Some said that the first to convert to Islam was Zayd b. Ḥarītha.<sup>29</sup> For instance, Ma‘mar [b. Rāshid] mentioned something similar to this from Zuhri. Some said that the first to convert to Islam was Khadija,<sup>30</sup> the Mother of the Believers. That is related through several lines of transmission from Zuhri. It is also the doctrine of Qatāda, Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Yasār and a number of others, in addition to being related from Ibn ‘Abbās. The Qur‘ān commentator Tha‘labī<sup>31</sup> – according to what we heard or read from him – claimed that scholars agreed that the first to convert to Islam was Khadija and that their disagreement pertained only to who was the first to convert after her. The most scrupulous course is to say that the first free man to convert was Abū Bakr, the first boy or youth was ‘Alī, the first woman was Khadija, the first client was Zayd and the first slave was Bilāl. God knows best.

7. The last of the Companions to die in absolute terms was Abu ’l-Tufayl Āmir b. Wāthila. He died in the year 100 after the Emigration [719 AD]. In regard to specific regions, the last Companion to die in Medina was Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal related this from Qatāda. Others said Sahl b. Sa‘d or al-Sā’ib b. Yazīd.<sup>32</sup> The last to die in Mecca was ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar. Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh is also named. ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī said that Abu ’l-Tufayl died in Mecca and therefore he was the last one there. The last Companion to die in al-Baṣra was Anas b. Mālik. Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr said, “I do not know of anyone, other than Abu ’l-Tufayl, who saw the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) who

<sup>25</sup> Ḥassān b. Thābit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥarām al-Anṣārī (d. ca. 60/680) was a poet who employed his gift to promote Islam; *EP*, 3:271–3.

<sup>26</sup> The Companion Zayd b. Arqam died in al-Kūfa around the year 66/686; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:165–8.

<sup>27</sup> The Companion al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr b. Tha‘labā al-Kindī (d. 33/654), known as al-Miqdād b. al-Aswad, was an important transmitter of ḥadīth from the Prophet; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 1:385–9.

<sup>28</sup> *Ulūm al-hadīth*, 22–3.

<sup>29</sup> Zayd b. Ḥarītha was the freedman and adopted son of the Prophet. He served as a commander in the early Muslim armies and died in action in the year 8/629 at about the age of fifty-five; *EP*, 4:1194.

<sup>30</sup> Khadija (d. 19/640) was the first wife of the Prophet. She was one of the first and staunchest supporters of his mission; *EP*, 3:898–9.

<sup>31</sup> Abū Ishāq Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Tha‘labī (d. 427/1035) was an expert in Qur‘ānic commentary and the Arabic language; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:350; *Suppl.*, 1:592.

<sup>32</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū Yazīd) al-Sā’ib b. Yazīd al-Kindī al-Madīnī is said to have died around 94/713; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:437–9.

died after him.”<sup>33</sup> The last of them to die in al-Kūfa was ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Awfā and in Syria, ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr<sup>34</sup> – and Abū Umāma<sup>35</sup> is also named.

One author went further, saying, “The last of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) to die in Egypt was ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Jaz̄ al-Zubaydī;<sup>36</sup> in Palestine, Abū Ubayy b. Umm Ḥarām;<sup>37</sup> in Damascus, Wāthila b. al-Asqa‘; in Homs, ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr; in al-Yamāma, al-Hirmās b. Ziyād;<sup>38</sup> in al-Jazīra [that is, northern Iraq], al-‘Urs b. ‘Amīra;<sup>39</sup> in Ifriqīya, Ruwayfa‘ b. Thābit;<sup>40</sup> and among the Bedouins in the desert, Salama b. al-Akwa<sup>41</sup> (May God be pleased with all of them).” There are disagreements over some of what we said here which we have passed over. The statement about Ruwayfa‘ in Ifriqīya is not correct. He died in the city of Barqa and his grave is there.<sup>42</sup> Salama came to Medina a few nights before his death and died there. God knows best.

33 *Iṣṭīāb*, 1:111.

34 Abū Ṣafwān ‘Abd Allāh b. Busr al-Māzīnī is said to have died around the year 90/709; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:430–3.

35 Abū Umāma al-Bahīlī died in Homs around the year 86/705; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:359–63.

36 Abu ’l-Ḥārith ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥārith b. Jaz̄ al-Zubaydī was present at the conquest of Egypt and settled there until his death around the year 85/704; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:387–8.

37 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭīāb*, 4:1592–3.

38 Abū Ḥudayr al-Hirmās b. Ziyād b. Mālik al-Bāhili seems to have still been alive around the year 90/709; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:450–1.

39 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭīāb*, 3:1062.

40 Ruwayfa‘ b. Thābit al-Anṣārī died in the year 56/676; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:36.

41 Abū ‘Āmir (or Abū Muslim or Abū Iyās) Salama b. ‘Amr b. al-Akwa‘ al-Aslāmī died in the year 74/693; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:326–31.

42 Historically, there was no precise delineation of the boundaries of the geographical designations Ifriqīya and al-Maghrib. Ibn al-Şalāh may have been one of those who considered Barqa (that is, Barca, modern-day al-Marj in Libya) to be part of al-Maghrib.

**Category 40**  
**THE FOLLOWERS**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-Tabi‘in)*

---

This and knowledge of the Companions form a fundamental source of reference for distinguishing loose (*mursal*) and supported ḥadīth (*musnad*). The expert al-Khaṭīb said, “A Follower is someone who associated with (*ṣahiba*) a Companion.”<sup>1</sup> Its unqualified application is specific to “the Follower who performs good deeds.”<sup>2</sup> A single Follower may equally be called *tābi‘* or *tābi‘i*. The remarks of Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim and others indicate that to be a Follower it is enough to hear ḥadīth from a Companion or meet him, even if what is commonly understood to be companionship never existed between them. Mere meeting and seeing are more likely to suffice for attaining the status of a Follower than that of a Companion in view of the requirements of the two terms.<sup>3</sup>

These are some important points regarding this Category.

1. The expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Hākim] said that the Followers have fifteen levels.<sup>4</sup> The first is those who had contact with the Ten [who were given the glad tidings of their entrance into Paradise], [that is,] the Followers Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib, Qays b. Abī Hāzim, Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī, Qays b. ‘Ubād,<sup>5</sup> Abū Sāsān Ḥuḍayn b. al-Mundhir,<sup>6</sup> Abū Wa‘il [Shaqīq b. Salāma al-Kūfī], Abū Rājā al-‘Uṭāridī<sup>7</sup> and others.<sup>8</sup>

He is wrong about some of these. Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib does not belong here, because he was born in the Caliphate of ‘Umar [b. al-Khaṭīb] and did not hear ḥadīth from most of the Ten. Indeed, someone said; “His relation from none of the Ten, except Sa‘id b. Abī Waqqāṣ,<sup>9</sup> is established.” Sa‘id was the last of them to die. Before his remarks mentioned above,

---

1 *Kifāya*, 22.

2 Qur‘ān 9:100.

3 It would appear that Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ regarded being a “companion” of someone as more demanding than being a “follower.”

4 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 42.

5 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Qays b. ‘Ubād al-Minqarī al-Qaysī came to Medina during the time of ‘Umar and met a number of the important Companions there; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):101.

6 Abū Sāsān Ḥuḍayn b. al-Mundhir al-Raqāshī transmitted from a number of Companions; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):128–9; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):311–12.

7 Abū Rājā Imrān b. Milhān (or Taym) al-‘Uṭāridī died around 105/723 at about one hundred and twenty years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:253–7.

8 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 42.

9 The prominent Companion Sa‘id b. Abī Waqqāṣ (d. ca. 55/675) played a leading role in most of the important events of the early days of Islam; *EI*, 8:669–70.

al-Ḥākim said that Sa‘id lived at the same time as ‘Umar and those after him, through the last of the Ten [to die]. He also said, “Sa‘id and Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim were the only Followers who lived at the same time as all of the Ten and heard ḥadīth from them.”<sup>10</sup> That does not gibe with what we quoted from him above.<sup>11</sup> True, Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim did hear ḥadīth from the Ten and related from them. He was the only Follower to relate from all of the Ten. The expert ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Yūsuf b. Khirāsh<sup>12</sup> said that. We also heard or read from him – and from Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī – that he said that Qays b. Abī Ḥāzim related from nine of them and did not relate from ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. ‘Awf.<sup>13</sup>

After those Followers come the children of Companions who were born during the lifetime of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), like ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalḥa,<sup>14</sup> Abū Umāma As‘ad b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf,<sup>15</sup> Abū Idrīs al-Khwālānī and others.

2. The “severed” Followers (*al-mukhaḍramūn min al-Tābi‘īn*) were those who lived in both pre-Islamic times (*al-jāhiliyya*) and during the lifetime of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), converted to Islam and did not have Companionship. One of them is called a *mukhaḍram*, as if he *khudrima*; that is, “were cut off” from his peers who attained Companionship and other things. Muslim mentioned them and counted twenty of them, including Abū ‘Amr al-Shaybānī,<sup>16</sup> Suwayd b. Ghafala al-Kindī,<sup>17</sup> ‘Amr b. Maymūn al-Awdī,<sup>18</sup> ‘Abd Khayr b. Yazid al-Khaywānī, Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Mull al-Nahdī and Abu ‘I-Halāl Rabi‘a b. Zurāra al-‘Atākī.<sup>19</sup> Abū Muslim ‘Abd Allāh b. Thuwab

10 *Ulūm al-hadīth*, 25.

11 That is, because Sa‘id b. al-Musayyad was not born until the caliphate ‘Umar, he was not alive during the lifetime of Abū Bakr.

12 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Yūsuf b. Sa‘id b. Khirāsh al-Marwāzī (d. 283/896) was an expert in ḥadīth who is reported to have had Shi‘ite leanings; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 13:508–10.

13 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. ‘Awf (d. ca. 32/653) was a prominent early convert to Islam who fought with the Prophet at most of his major battles; *EF*, 1:84.

14 ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Ṭalḥa Zayd was the half-brother of the famous Companion Anas b. Mālik; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:482–4.

15 Some were of the opinion that Abū Umāma As‘ad b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf al-Anṣārī saw the Prophet. He is said to have died in 100/719; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:517–19.

16 Abū ‘Amr Sa‘d b. Iyās al-Shaybānī was a Kūfan who died around 91/710; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:173–4.

17 Abū Umayya Suwayd b. Ghafala b. ‘Awsaja al-Kindī al-Kūftī was born about the same time as the Prophet and died around 81/700. He transmitted ḥadīth from a number of the most important Companions; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:69–73.

18 Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Amr b. Maymūn al-Awdī settled in al-Kūfa and died in 75/694; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:158–61.

19 Abu ‘I-Halāl Rabi‘a b. Zurāra al-‘Atākī died at the age of one hundred and twenty; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):285–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):474.

al-Khwālānī<sup>20</sup> and al-Āhnaf b. Qays<sup>21</sup> are among those whom Muslim did not mention. God knows best.

3. “The Seven Jurists of Medina” (*al-fuqahā’ al-sab‘a min ahl al-Madīna*) – namely Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib, al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad,<sup>22</sup> ‘Urwa b. al-Zubayr, Khārijah b. Zayd,<sup>23</sup> Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān, ‘Ubayd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Utba and Sulaymān b. Yasār<sup>24</sup> – were among the older Followers (*akābir al-Tābi‘in*). We heard that the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh [al-Hākim] said, “In the opinion of most of the Ḥijāzi scholars, these are the Seven Jurists. We heard that Ibn al-Mubārak said, “The Medinese jurists whose legal views they promulgate were seven in number,” and he named these. However, he gave Sālim b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar instead of Abū Salama b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān. We heard Abu ‘l-Zinād’s enumeration of them in his book about them and he mentioned these. However, he gave Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān<sup>25</sup> instead of Abū Salama and Sālim.

4. It is reported that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbāl said, “Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib was the best Follower.” When he was asked, “And ‘Alqama [b. Qays] and al-Aswad?” he replied, “Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib, ‘Alqama and al-Aswad.” It is also reported that he said, “I do not know of another Follower like Abū ‘Uthmān al-Nahdī and Qays b. Abī Ḥazīm.” It is also reported that he said, “The best Followers were Qays, Abū ‘Uthmān, ‘Alqama and Maṣrūq. These were excellent and in the upper stratum of Followers.” I liked what I found in a book of the teacher and ascetic Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Khafif al-Shirāzī.<sup>26</sup> “People disagree over the best of the Followers. The Medinese say, ‘Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib.’ The Kūfāns say, ‘Uways al-Qarānī.<sup>27</sup> The Baṣrāns say, ‘Al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī.’”

We read that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbāl did say, “Al-Ḥasan and ‘Aṭā’ [b. Abī Rabāḥ] gave the most legal judgements;” that is, from among the

20 Abū Muslim al-Khwālānī was a Yemenite who entered Medina during the caliphate of Abū Bakr. He died in 62/682 while campaigning against the Byzantines; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:7–14.

21 Abū Bahār al-Āhnaf b. Qays b. Mu‘āwiya al-Tamīmī (his *ism* is disputed) was one of the first inhabitants of al-Baṣra. He fought in the eastern conquests and died in 67/687 fighting the Shiīte rebel al-Mukhtār; *EP*, 1:303–4.

22 Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad (ca. 37/657–ca. 110/728) was the grandson of the caliph Abū Bakr. He was famed for his piety and expertise in ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:279.

23 Abū Zayd Khārijah b. Zayd b. Thābit al-Anṣārī died around the year 100/719; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:437–41.

24 Sulaymān b. Yasār (d. ca. 109/727) was a client of the Prophet’s wife Maymūna; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:444–8.

25 Abū Bakr b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmī (d. ca. 95/714) was, among other things, a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:416–19.

26 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Khafif al-Shirāzī (ca. 268/882–371/982) was a well-traveled Sufi; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:663–4.

27 Abū ‘Amr Uways b. ‘Amir al-Qarānī (d. 37/657) was a famous early ascetic; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:19–33.

Followers. He also said, “‘Aṭṭā’ was the legal expert who was consulted in Mecca (*mufti Makka*) as al-Ḥasan was in al-Baṣra. The people often solicited their legal judgements as well as their opinions.”

We read that Abū Bakr b. Abī Dāwūd said, “The two leading women of the Followers were Ḥafṣa bint Sirīn<sup>28</sup> and ‘Amra bint ‘Abd Al-Rahmān and the third – and she was not the equal of the first two – was Umm al-Dardā’.<sup>29</sup> God knows best.

5. We heard that Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim said,<sup>30</sup> “There is also a level the people consider to be Followers although none of them has an established audition from the Companions. They include the jurist Ibrāhīm b. Suwayd al-Nakha‘ī<sup>31</sup> – and he is not the jurist Ibrāhīm b. Yazid al-Nakha‘ī – Bukayr b. Abi ‘l-Samīt<sup>32</sup> and Bukayr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ashajj,<sup>33</sup> and he mentioned others.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim added,<sup>34</sup> “Furthermore, there is a level the people consider to be followers of the Followers although they met some of the Companions. These include Abu ‘l-Zinād ‘Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān, who met ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, Anas [b. Mālik] and Hishām b. ‘Urwa. He was brought before ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar, Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh and Mūsā b. ‘Uqba and was alive during the lifetime of Anas b. Mālik and Umm Khālid bint Khālid b. Sa‘id b. al-Āṣi.”<sup>35</sup>

Comments can be made about some of what Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim has said. There are also some people who are considered Followers while they are really Companions. The most surprising instance of that is Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim regarding al-Nu‘mān<sup>36</sup> and Suwayd,<sup>37</sup> the sons of Muqarrin al-Muzanī, as Followers, when he mentions the Brothers who were Followers.<sup>38</sup> They are well known to be Companions and frequently mentioned among the Companions. God knows best.

<sup>28</sup> Umm al-Hudhayl Ḥafṣa (d. after 100/719) was the sister of the famous Muḥammad b. Sirīn. She was a pious woman respected for her knowledge of ḥadīth, law and the Qur‘ān; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:198.

<sup>29</sup> Hujayma (or Juhayma) al-Waṣṣābiya, known as Umm al-Dardā’ al-Šughrā, was the wife of Abu ‘l-Dardā’ and an expert in religious law. She died after 81/700; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:277–9.

<sup>30</sup> *Ulūm al-hadīth*, 45.

<sup>31</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, (1):290–91; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 1(1):103.

<sup>32</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 1(2):116; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 1(1):406.

<sup>33</sup> Bukayr b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ashajj (d. ca. 127/745) was a transmitter of ḥadīth who seems to have ended his days in Egypt; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:170–74.

<sup>34</sup> *Ulūm al-hadīth*, 45–6.

<sup>35</sup> According to Dhahabī, Umm Khālid bint Khālid (d. ca. 90/709) was the last of the female Companions to die; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:370–71.

<sup>36</sup> Abū Ḥākim (or Abū ‘Amr) al-Nu‘mān b. Muqarrin b. ‘Āṣidh (d. 21/642) was the standard bearer of his tribe at the conquest of Mecca; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:356–8.

<sup>37</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:680.

<sup>38</sup> *Ulūm al-hadīth*, 154.

## Category 41

### OLDER PEOPLE TRANSMITTING ḤADĪTH FROM YOUNGER ONES

(*Ma‘rifat al-akābir al-ruwāt ‘an al-aṣāghir*)

---

One benefit from this Category is that it will not be mistakenly assumed that the person being transmitted from is older than or superior to the person transmitting on the basis that in most instances that is the case. [If that is automatically assumed], their true status will not be known. It has been established that ‘Ā’isha (God be pleased with her) said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) ordered us to put people in their proper place.” Such cases take several forms.

One is that the transmitter is older and belongs to an earlier generation than the person from whom he transmitted ḥadīth. That was the case of Zuhri and Yaḥyā b. Sa‘id al-Anṣārī in their relation from Mālik. It was also the case of the later scholar Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Azhari<sup>1</sup> – one of the teachers of al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] – who transmitted from al-Khaṭīb in some of his works, and al-Khaṭīb was at that time in the prime of his youth and his days as a student.

Another form is that the transmitter is greater in stature than the person from whom he related ḥadīth, because he is a knowledgeable expert and the person he transmits from is only a teacher (*shaykh*) who just transmits. This was the case with Mālik in his relation from ‘Abd Allāh b. Dīnār; and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Ishaq b. Rāhawayh in their relation from ‘Ubayd Allāh b. Mūsā. There are many instances of that.

Another form of this is that the transmitter is greater in both respects. Examples of this are the many scholars and experts who relate from their students and pupils; for instance, the relation of the expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī [b. Sa‘id] from Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Šūrī, the relation of Abū Bakr al-Barqānī from al-Khaṭīb,<sup>2</sup> the relation of al-Khaṭīb from Abū Naṣr b. Mākūlā. Similar cases are numerous.

Subsumed under this Category are the instances of a Companion transmitting ḥadīth from a Follower which are cited, like the relation of the ‘Abd Allāhs and other Companions from Ka'b al-Āḥbār.<sup>3</sup> The same is true of the relation of a Follower from a follower of a Follower, for instance the relation of Zuhri and [Abū Sa‘id Yaḥyā b. Sa‘id] al-Anṣārī from Mālik, which we mentioned above. The same was true of ‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b.

---

1 Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Azhari (355/966–435/1043) was a respected and prolific scholar of ḥadīth; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Tārīkh Baghdaḍ*, 10:385; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:578.

2 Needless to say, few would agree with the author that Abū Bakr al-Barqānī, for all of his merits, was of greater stature than al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī.

3 The authority on the Bible Abū Ishaq Ka'b b. Māṭī (d. 32/652 or 34/654), popularly known as Ka'b al-Āḥbār, was a Yemenite Jew who converted to Islam; *ET*, 4:316–17; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:304–5.

al-‘Āṣ.<sup>4</sup> He was not a Follower, yet more than twenty Followers transmitted from him. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghani b. Sa‘id collected the names of those Followers in a small book. I read in the handwriting of the expert Abū Muḥammad al-Ṭabāsi<sup>5</sup> in one of his compilations that he said, “‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb was not a Follower, yet some seventy Followers transmitted ḥadīth from him.” God knows best.

---

4 Abu Ibrāhim ‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb was an expert in law and ḥadīth who lived in al-Ṭā’if. He was a member of the generation after the Followers, although his exact dates do not seem to have been recorded; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:165–80.

5 This appears to be a reference to Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abī Ja‘far al-Ṭabāsi, whose *kunya* is usually given as “Abu ’l-Fadl.” He was a Sufi who died in Tabas in 482/1089; Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:496; *Suppl.*, 1:907.

## Category 42

### SYMMETRICAL TRANSMISSIONS,<sup>1</sup> AND OTHER INSTANCES OF PEERS TRANSMITTING FROM ONE ANOTHER

(*Ma'trifat al-mudabbaj wa-mā 'adāhu min  
riwāyat al-aqrān ba'dihim 'an ba'd*)

Peers are those who are alike in regard to age and [their relative position] in isnāds. Occasionally Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim was satisfied with their being alike in regard to isnāds, even if there was no similarity in regard to their age. Be aware that the relation of one peer from another falls into different subcategories.

One is the “symmetrical,” and this is two peers relating from each other. An example of this from the Companions is 'Ā'isha and Abū Hurayra, each of whom related from the other. An example from the Followers is the relation of Zuhri from 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Aziz and the relation of 'Umar from Zuhri. An example from the followers of the Followers is the relation of Mālik from Awzā'i and the relation of Awzā'i from Mālik. An example from the followers of the followers [of the Followers] is the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥaribal from 'Ali b. al-Madīnī and the relation of 'Ali from Ahmad. Al-Hākim gave as an example of the last the relation of Ahmad b. Ḥanbal from 'Abd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] and the relation of 'Abd al-Razzāq from Ahmad, and that is not satisfactory.<sup>2</sup>

An example of the relation of peers which is not symmetrical consists of one of the peers relating from the other while the other – so far as we know – did not relate from him. An example of this is the relation of Sulaymān al-Taymī from Mis'ar.<sup>3</sup> They were peers and we do not know of a case of Mis'ar relating from Taymī. There are many examples like this. God knows best.

1 This translation is based on the derivation of *mudabbaj* Ibn Hajar proposes in *Nuzhat al-naẓar*, 110.

2 *'Ulūm al-hadīth*, 218. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ may have been objecting to regarding them as peers because 'Abd al-Razzāq was already thirty-eight lunar years old at the time of Ahmad's birth. This would then be an example of al-Hākim ignoring ages.

3 Abū Salama Mis'ar b. Kidām b. Zuhayr al-Kūfī (d. 155/772) was considered by some to be the greatest transmitter of his day in al-Kūfa; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:163–73.

**Category 43**  
**BROTHERS AND SISTERS**  
**AMONG SCHOLARS AND TRANSMITTERS**  
*(Ma‘rifat al-ikhwā wa-’l-akhawāt min  
al-‘ulamā’ wa-’l-ruwāt)*

---

This is one of the branches of knowledge which the scholars of ḥadīth have treated in independent works. ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī,<sup>1</sup> Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasawī [that is, Nasā’ī], Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-Sarrāj<sup>2</sup> and others composed books on it.

Examples of two siblings from the Companions are the brothers ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd and ‘Utbah b. Mas‘ūd,<sup>3</sup> the brothers Zayd b. Thābit and Yazid b. Thābit,<sup>4</sup> and the brothers ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ<sup>5</sup> and Hishām b. al-‘Āṣ.<sup>6</sup> Examples from the Followers are Abū Maysara ‘Amr b. Shurahbil and his brother Arqam b. Shurahbil,<sup>7</sup> both of whom were among the finest students of [‘Abd Allāh] b. Mas‘ūd. Huzayl b. Shurahbil<sup>8</sup> and Arqam b. Shurahbil were two other brothers who were also students of Ibn Mas‘ūd.

---

1 This appears to be a reference to Ibn al-Madīnī’s *Tasmiyat man ruwīya ‘anhu min awlād al-‘ashara wa-ghayrihim min Aṣḥāb Rāsūl Allāh*, which contains a section on brothers and sisters. This work has been published with Abū Dawūd al-Sijistānī’s *Tasmiyat al-ikhwā wa-’l-akhawāt* in a volume entitled *al-Ruwāt min al-ikhwā wa-’l-akhawāt*, ed. Bāsim Fayṣal al-Jawābāra (Riyadh, 1408/1988).

2 Muḥammad b. Ishaq al-Thaqafī al-Sarrāj al-Nisabūrī (216/831–313/925) was a famous scholar of ḥadīth and a prolific author. Among his works was a *musnad* and a *ta’rīkh*, which Bukhārī is said to have used; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:173.

3 Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 1:500.

4 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1572.

5 Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ al-Sahīmī was a Qurayshīte from Mecca who converted to Islam in the year 8/629. He led the invasion of Egypt which culminated in the capture of Alexandria in 21/642 and then served as the governor of Egypt until the caliph Uthmān removed him. He aided the founder of the Umayyad dynasty Mu‘āwiya in defeating the caliph ‘Alī and resumed his position in Egypt until his death around 42/663; *EF*, 1:451.

6 Hishām was an early convert to Islam who participated in a number of the famous battles and died in combat; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 3:77–9.

7 Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ seems to have been under the impression that there were two Arqam b. Shurahbils, one the brother of ‘Amr and the other the brother of Huzayl. The sources only know a single Arqam b. Shurahbil – e.g., Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 1(2):46; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):310 – and the notion of two Arqams was explicitly rejected by later commentators; e.g., ‘Iraqī, *Tagyīd*, 337–8.

8 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 4(2):245.

Examples of three brothers are Sahl,<sup>9</sup> ‘Abbād<sup>10</sup> and ‘Uthmān,<sup>11</sup> the sons of Ḥunayf; and ‘Amr b. Shu‘ayb, ‘Umar<sup>12</sup> and Shu‘ayb,<sup>13</sup> the sons of Shu‘ayb b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-Āṣ.<sup>14</sup>

An example of four brothers is Suhayl b. Abī Ṣalīḥ al-Sammān al-Zayyāt and his brothers ‘Abd Allāh<sup>15</sup> – who was also called ‘Abbād – Muḥammad<sup>16</sup> and Ṣalīḥ.<sup>17</sup>

An example of five is what we hear from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim. He said, “I heard the expert Abū ‘Ali al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali more than once say, ‘Ādām b. ‘Uyayna,<sup>18</sup> ʻImrān b. ‘Uyayna,<sup>19</sup> Muḥammad b. ‘Uyayna,<sup>20</sup> Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna and Ibrāhim b. ‘Uyayna<sup>21</sup> transmitted ḥadīth from up to the last of them.’”<sup>22</sup>

An example of six are the children of Sirīn, six Followers. They are Muḥammad, Anas,<sup>23</sup> Yaḥyā,<sup>24</sup> Maṭbad,<sup>25</sup> Hafṣa and Karima.<sup>26</sup> Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Nasawī gave them thus – and I transmitted it from a copy of his book which was written in what I think is the handwriting of Dāraqutnī. That is also related from Yaḥyā b. Maṭin and al-Ḥākim gave them thus in *Kitāb Ma‘rifatā* [that is, *Kitāb ma‘rifat ulūm al-ḥadīth27 However, he said in what we hear from his *Ta’rīkh*,<sup>28</sup> through our isnād from him, that he heard the expert Abū ‘Ali [al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali] mention the Banū Sirīn as five siblings: Muḥammad b. Sirīn; the eldest of them, Maṭbad b. Sirīn; Yaḥyā b. Sirīn; Khālid b. Sirīn;<sup>29</sup> Anas b.*

9 Sahl b. Hunayf b. Wāhib al-Anṣārī (five different *kunyās* are suggested for him), like his brother ‘Uthmān, was considered a Companion. He served as a lieutenant of ‘Ali and died in al-Kūfa in 38/658; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:325–9.

10 I have not succeeded in locating ‘Abbād in any of the sources I consulted.

11 Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Uthmān (d. ca. 50/670) served as a governor under ‘Umar and ‘Ali and played an important role in the development of the taxation policy of the Muslim empire; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 2:320–2.

12 I have not found any information about ‘Umar.

13 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 2(2):218; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(1):347.

14 Dhahabi suggested that the father Shu‘ayb died after the year 80/699; *Siyar*, 5:181.

15 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 3(1):83–4, 3(2):38 (s.n. ‘Abbād); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):50, 3(1):78–9 (s.n. ‘Abbād).

16 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 1(1):79; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):252.

17 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 2(2):279, 283–4; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(1):400–1.

18 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):267.

19 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 3(2):427; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):302.

20 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 1(1):204; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):42.

21 Ibrāhim (ca. 120/738–199/815) was a good man and an average transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:475.

22 ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 155.

23 Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:622–3.

24 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 4(2):275; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):153.

25 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):280.

26 I have not located her in the sources.

27 Anas is given as “Ants” (or “Unays”) in the printed text of ‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 153.

28 This would appear to be a reference to al-Ḥākim’s *Ta’rīkh Nisābūr*, although it is not clear why the Baṣrān Ibn Sirīn family would be discussed in that book.

29 I have not found Khālid in the sources.

Sîrin; and the youngest of them, Hafṣâ bint Sîrin.” It was related from Muḥammad from Yaḥyâ from Anas from Anas b. Mâlik that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “God, we respond in all sincerity, subservient like slaves!” This is an oddity which someone made into a riddle by asking, “Which three brothers related from one another?”

An example of seven is al-Nu‘mân b. Muqarrin and his brothers Ma‘qil,<sup>30</sup> ‘Aqil,<sup>31</sup> Suwayd, Sinân,<sup>32</sup> ‘Abd al-Râhmân<sup>33</sup> and a seventh who is not named for us. The Banû Muqarrin al-Muzaniyûn are seven brothers who participated in the Emigration from Mecca to Medina and associated with the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). According to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr<sup>34</sup> and a number of others, no one else shared this excellent distinction with them. It has been said that all of them were present at the Battle of the Trench.

Sometimes there is some disagreement regarding the exact number of the siblings. We will not lengthen our book with groups of siblings numbering more than seven, because of their rarity and the irrelevance of that to our present purpose. God knows best.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Isti‘âb*, 3:1432.

<sup>31</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Isti‘âb*, 3:1079.

<sup>32</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Isti‘âb*, 2:659.

<sup>33</sup> I have not uncovered any information about ‘Abd al-Râhmân.

<sup>34</sup> *Isti‘âb*, 3:1432.

## Category 44

### THE TRANSMISSION BY FATHERS FROM THEIR SONS

(*Ma‘rifat riwāyat al-ābā’ ‘an al-abnā’*)

---

Al-Khaṭīb has a book on this.<sup>1</sup> As an example of this, we heard the ḥadīth from al-‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib<sup>2</sup> from his son al-Faḍl<sup>3</sup> (God be pleased with them) regarding the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) combining the two prayers at al-Muzdalifa.

We also heard in this regard from Wa‘il b. Dāwūd<sup>4</sup> from his son Bakr b. Wa‘il<sup>5</sup> – and they are both reliable – several ḥadīth, including the ḥadīth from [Sufyān] b. ‘Uyayna from Wa‘il b. Dāwūd from his son Bakr from Zuhri from Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib from Abū Hurayra. He said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘Delay your religious duties, our hands are suspended and our feet tied.’” Al-Khaṭīb said, “So far as we know, this ḥadīth is not related from the Prophet (Peace be upon him) by anyone but Bakr and his father.”

We heard that Mu‘tamir b. Sulaymān al-Taymi<sup>6</sup> said, “My father transmitted to me, saying, ‘You transmitted to me from me from Ayyūb [al-Sakhiyānī] from al-Hasan [al-Baṣrī]. He said, “‘Woe’ is a word of blessing.”’” This is an unusual report which embraces several Categories. We heard around sixteen ḥadīth from Abū ‘Umar Ḥafṣ b. ‘Umar al-Dūrī al-Muqrī<sup>7</sup> from his son Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. Ḥafṣ<sup>8</sup> and that is the most we heard a father have from his son.

The last and most recent instance of this Category is the ḥadīth Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar ‘Abd al-Rahīm, the son of the expert Abū Sa‘d [‘Abd al-Karīm al-Sam‘ānī] al-Marwāzī, (God bless them) personally transmitted to me in Marv. He said, My father informed me from me in what I read in his handwriting. He said, My son Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar ‘Abd al-Rahīm transmitted to me personally and from his written original. Abū Sa‘d gave it with his isnād from Abū Umāma [As‘ad b. Sahl b. Ḥunayf] that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “Supply your table with cabbage for it drives away the devil when ‘In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate’ is spoken.”

---

1 *Riwāyat al-ābā’ ‘an al-abnā’*; Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 914.

2 Al-‘Abbās (d. 32/653) was the paternal uncle of the Prophet; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:78–103.

3 Abū Muḥammad al-Faḍl (d. 18/639) was the eldest child of al-‘Abbās; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):114; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 3(2):63.

4 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):176; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):43.

5 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):95–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):393.

6 Mu‘tamir, the son of the famous Sulaymān b. Ṭarkhān al-Taymi al-Baṣrī, was born in 106/724 and died in al-Baṣra in 187/803; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:477–9.

7 Abū ‘Umar al-Dūrī (d. ca. 246/860) was an expert in the Qur’ān; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:541–3.

8 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 3(2):236–7.

The ḥadīth which we heard from Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq from [his daughter] ‘Ā’ishā in which the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “In the black seed is a cure for every disease,” is an error from one of those who related it. Rather, it is from Abū Bakr b. Abī ‘Atīq from ‘Ā’ishā, and this Abū Bakr is ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq.<sup>9</sup> Those people are the ones about whom Mūsā b. ‘Uqbā said, “We do not know of four – they and their descendants – who lived at the same time as the Prophet (Peace be upon him) except those four,” and he named Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq, his father,<sup>10</sup> Abū Bakr’s son ‘Abd al-Rahmān<sup>11</sup> and the last’s son Abū ‘Atīq Muḥammad<sup>12</sup> [sic]. God knows best.

9 Ibn Abī ‘Atīq was known for his sharp wit; *EP*, 3:682.

10 Abū Quhāfa ‘Uthmān b. ‘Amir converted to Islam upon the conquest of Mecca and is considered a Companion. He died in 14/635 at the age of ninety-seven; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣrāb*, 4:1732–3.

11 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rahmān, the son of Abū Bakr and the brother of the Prophet’s wife ‘Ā’ishā, died in 53/673; Dhahabi; *Siyar*, 2:471–3.

12 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣrāb*, 3:1374.

## Category 45

### THE TRANSMISSION BY SONS FROM THEIR FATHERS

(*Ma‘rifat riwāyat al-abnā‘ an al-āba‘*)

---

The expert Abū Naṣr al-Wā’ili [al-Sijzī] has a book on this.<sup>1</sup> The most critical instances are when the actual name of the father or grandfather is not given. They fall into two categories.

1. The relation of a son from a father from a grandfather: an example is “Amr b. Shu‘ayb from his father from his grandfather.” Amr has a large *nuskha* with this isnād, which consists mostly of excellent ḥadīth on legal topics. Shu‘ayb is the son of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ.<sup>2</sup> Most of the scholars of ḥadīth cite his ḥadīth as proofs, interpreting the unqualified designation of “grandfather”<sup>3</sup> in the isnād as a reference to the Companion ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ, rather than ‘Abd Allāh’s son Muḥammad, the father of Shu‘ayb,<sup>4</sup> on account of the instances of ‘Abd Allāh being designated as that person which they came across.<sup>5</sup>

Similar to this is “Bahz b. Ḥakim from his father from his grandfather.” Bahz related a fine large *nuskha* with this isnād. “His grandfather” is Mu‘āwiya b. Hayda al-Qushayri.<sup>6</sup>

A further example is “Ṭalḥa b. Muṣarrif” from his father from his grandfather” and “his grandfather” is ‘Amr b. Ka‘b al-Yāmī, or, it is said, Ka‘b b. ‘Amr.<sup>8</sup>

The most amusing example of that is the relation of the Hanbalite jurist Abu ’l-Faraj ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Tamimi<sup>9</sup> – and he had a circle for

---

1 *Kitāb Riwayat al-abnā‘ an abdihim*; Kattāni, *Risāla*, 163.

2 Muḥammad al-Sahmi seems to have been primarily known for his transmissions from his father; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:181–3.

3 The question here revolves around the correct interpretation of the Arabic word *jadd*, which commonly means “grandfather” but may validly be applied to more remote ancestors as well.

4 If they did not take the Companion ‘Abd Allāh to be the “grandfather,” they would not have been able to cite the ḥadīth because they would have been “loose.”

5 That is, ‘Abd Allāh is actually named in some of the isnāds attached to these ḥadīth; see Bulqīni, *Mahāsin*, 541.

6 Mu‘āwiya b. Hayda al-Qushayri was a Companion of the Prophet. He was the grandfather of Bahz’s father; Bukhārt, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):329; Ibn Abi Ḥatim, *Jārī*, 4(1):376.

7 Abū Muḥammad Ṭalḥa b. Muṣarrif al-Yāmī al-Hamdāni was an unusual Kūfan who liked the caliph Uthmān and regarded *nabidh* as forbidden; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:191–3. According to the *nasab* of Ṭalḥa given by Bukhārt, Ka‘b was his grandfather; *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):346.

8 This Companion appears both ways in isnāds; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣrāb*, 3:1199, 1322–3.

9 Abu ’l-Faraj died in 425/1034; Ibn Abi Yaqā, *Tabaqāt al-Ḥanābila*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥamid al-Fiqī, 2 vols (Cairo, 1371/1952), 1:182.

preaching and issuing legal opinions in the Mosque of Manṣūr in Baghdad – from his father with nine of his ancestors in succession. The teacher Abu 'l-Hasan Mu'ayyad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī al-Nisābūri<sup>10</sup> informed me of it through my recitation to him in Nishapur. He said, Abū Manṣūr 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Muḥammad al-Shaybāni<sup>11</sup> informed us in his letter to us. He said, the expert Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī [that is, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī] informed us. He said, 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. 'Abd al-'Azīz b. al-Hārith b. Asad b. al-Layth b. Sulaymān b. al-Aswad b. Sufyān b. Yazid b. Ūkayna b. 'Abd Allāh al-Tamīmī personally transmitted to us. He said, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard my father saying, I heard 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. He was asked about "the Merciful Giver" (*al-hannān al-mannān*). He said, "Merciful" is the one who turns toward someone who turns away from him. 'Giver' is the one who gives a gift before it is requested." The last of them is Ūkayna, and he is the one who heard 'Alī (God be pleased with him).<sup>12</sup>

Abu 'l-Muzaffar 'Abd al-Rahīm, the son of the expert Abū Sa'īd al-Samā'ī, transmitted to me in Marv al-Shāhjān from Abu 'l-Naṣr 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Fāmī.<sup>13</sup> He said, I heard the descendent of the Prophet Abu 'l-Qāsim Maṇṣūr b. Muḥammad al-‘Alawī<sup>14</sup> saying, “Part of a [good] isnād is elevated transmitters and part of it is noble features. A man saying, ‘My father transmitted to me from my grandfather,’ is one of the noble features.”

2. The relation of a son from his father without the grandfather: this is a vast topic. An example is the relation of Abu 'l-'Usharā' al-Dārimī from his father from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him). His ḥadīth are well known but his identity has been disputed. The best-known view is that Abu 'l-'Usharā' is Usāma b. Mālik b. Qīḥṭam. According to what I transmitted from the handwriting of Bayhaqī and others, the name of his grandfather is pronounced "Qīḥṭam." "Qīḥṭam" is also given. It is also said that Abu 'l-'Usharā' al-Dārimī is 'Uṭārid b. Barz. It is also pronounced "Baraz." Some instead say "Ibn Balz." There are also other disagreements concerning his name and the name of his father.<sup>15</sup> God knows best.

<sup>10</sup> Abu 'l-Hasan Muṣayyad b. Muḥammad b. 'Ali al-Tūsi al-Nisabūri (524/1130–617/1220) received several major collections of hadith at an early age and then lived long enough to become a sought-after transmitter of them; Dhahabi, *Sīyar*, 22:104–7.

<sup>11</sup> Known as al-Qazzāz (453/1061–535/1141), he transmitted *Ta'rikh Baghdād* from al-Khaṭīb; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:69–70.

<sup>12</sup> Al-Khatib al-Baghdadi, *Tarikh Baghdad*, 11:32.

<sup>13</sup> Abu 'l-Naṣr 'Abd al-Rahmān b. 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Ḥarawī al-Fāmī (472/1080–546/1152) was a good man who studied hadith; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:297–9.

14 I have not been able to identify this individual.

<sup>15</sup> See Bukhari, *al-Tarikh al-kabir*, 1(2):21–2; Ibn Abi Hatim, *Jarh*, 1(1):283, 3(2):33.

## Category 46

THOSE FROM WHOM TWO TRANSMITTERS, ONE EARLY AND ONE LATE  
WITH A GREAT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEIR DATES OF DEATH – SO  
THERE IS A GREAT DIFFERENCE IN THE TIME BETWEEN  
THEM – BOTH RELATE, EVEN IF THE LATER ONE OF  
THEM IS NOT REGARDED AS A CONTEMPORARY OF  
THE FIRST OR A MEMBER OF HIS GENERATION

(*Ma'rifat man ishtaraka fi 'l-riwāya 'anhu rāwiyān mutaqaddim  
wa-muta'akhkhir tabāyana waqt wafātayhim tabāyunan  
shadidan fa-haṣala baynahum amad ba'id wa-in kāna  
al-muta'akhkhir minhumā ghayr ma'dūd min  
mu'āṣiri 'l-awwal wa-dhawī ṭabaqatihī*)

---

One of the uses of this Category is to fix the sweetness of elevated isnāds in human hearts. Al-Khaṭīb devoted a fine book to this subject called *Kitāb al-Sābiq wa-'l-lāhiq'* (*The First and Last Students of Transmitters*). An example of this is Muḥammad b. Ishaq al-Thaqafī al-Sarrāj al-Nisābūrī. The authority Bukhārī related from him in his *Ta'rīkh* and Abu 'l-Husayn Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Khaffāf al-Nisābūrī<sup>2</sup> also related from him. There is a span of 137 [lunar] years or more between their deaths, since Bukhārī died in 256 [870 AD] and al-Khaffāf died in either 393 [1002 AD], 394 or 395.

Another example is the *imām* Mālik b. Anas. Zuhrī and Zakariyā<sup>3</sup> b. Duwayd al-Kindī<sup>3</sup> transmitted ḥadīth from him and there is a span of 137 [lunar] years or more between their deaths. Zuhrī died in 124 [742 AD]. Mālik was favored with many transmissions belonging to this Category. God knows best.

---

1 Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:col. 973.

2 Al-Khaffāf was one of the most elevated transmitters of ḥadīth of his era; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:481–2.

3 According to Ibn Ḥibbān, “he used to tour Syria, transmitting [his forgeries] to the inhabitants and claiming that he was one hundred and thirty-five years old,” *Majrūḥīn*, 1:314–15.

## Category 47

### COMPANIONS, FOLLOWERS AND LATER FIGURES (GOD BE PLEASED WITH THEM) FROM WHOM ONLY A SINGLE TRANSMITTER RELATED ḤADĪTH

*(Ma‘rifat man lam yarwi ‘anhu illā rāwin wāhid min  
al-Šahāba wa-’l-Tābi‘in fa-man ba‘dahum)*

---

Muslim has a book on this subject which I have not seen.<sup>1</sup> The following are some examples from the Companions:

Wahb b. Khanbash<sup>2</sup> was a Companion from whom Sha‘bī alone related ḥadīth. He appears as “Harim b. Khanbash” in the books of al-Hākim<sup>3</sup> and Abū Nu‘aym al-İsbahānī<sup>4</sup> on the sciences of ḥadīth and this form of his name is an error originating in the relation of Dāwūd al-Awdī<sup>5</sup> from Sha‘bī.

The same is true of ‘Āmir b. Shahr,<sup>6</sup> Urwa b. Mudarris,<sup>7</sup> Muḥammad b. Ṣafwān al-Anṣārī<sup>8</sup> and Muḥammad b. Shayfī al-Anṣārī<sup>9</sup> – these last two are not the same person, although some people said that they were. These were also Companions from whom only Sha‘bī related ḥadīth.

Qays b. Abī Hāzim was alone in relating ḥadīth from his father,<sup>10</sup> Dukayn b. Sa‘īd al-Muzānī,<sup>11</sup> al-Şunābīh b. al-Aslām<sup>12</sup> and Mirdās b. Mālik al-Aslāmī, all of whom were Companions.

Qudāma b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kilābī<sup>13</sup> is also one of them. Only Ayman b. Nābil<sup>14</sup> related ḥadīth from him.

---

1 *Kitāb al-Munfaridāt wa-’l-wuhdān*, ed. ‘Abd al-Ghaffār Sulaymān al-Bundārī (Beirut, 1408/1988).

2 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1560.

3 *‘Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 158.

4 According to Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalānī, Abū Nu‘aym wrote a *mustakhraj* on al-Hākim’s work; *Nuzhat al-nazar*, 4.

5 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):239–40; Ibn Abī Hatim, *Jārh*, 1(2):427–8.

6 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:792.

7 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1067.

8 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1370.

9 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1371.

10 ‘Awdh (or ‘Awf) b. al-Hārith b. Rifa‘a al-Anṣārī; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1225–6, s.n. ‘Awf b. ‘Afra‘.

11 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:462.

12 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:740.

13 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):178; Ibn Abī Hatim, *Jārh*, 3(2):127.

14 Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 6:309–10.

Among the Companions there is a group from whom only their sons related ḥadīth, including

Shakal b. Ḥumayd:<sup>15</sup> his son Shutayr<sup>16</sup> is the only one who related ḥadīth from him.

One of them is al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn al-Qurashi<sup>17</sup> his son Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him.

Mu‘āwiya b. Hayda: his son Ḥakim,<sup>18</sup> the father of Bahz, was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him.

Qurra b. Iyās:<sup>19</sup> no one related ḥadīth from him beside his son Mu‘āwiya.<sup>20</sup>

Abū Laylā al-Anṣāri:<sup>21</sup> his son ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā<sup>22</sup> was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim in *al-Madkhāl fi Kitāb al-Iklīl*<sup>23</sup> (*Introduction to The Book of the Crown*) expressed the opinion that Bukhārī and Muslim did not include in their *Saḥīhs* the ḥadīth of any individual of this type. He was criticized for that claim and it is refuted by Bukhārī’s including in his *Saḥīh* the ḥadīth of Qays b. Abī Ḥazīm from Mirdās al-Aslāmi, “The righteous will disappear one by one.”<sup>24</sup> Qays was the only transmitter from Mirdās al-Aslāmi. It is also refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion<sup>25</sup> – rather the inclusion by both Bukhārī and Muslim<sup>26</sup> – of the ḥadīth of al-Musayyib b. Ḥazn on the death of Abū Ṭālib,<sup>27</sup> although his son [that is, Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib] was the sole transmitter from him. It is further refuted by Bukhārī’s inclusion of the ḥadīth of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī from ‘Amr b. Taghlib,<sup>28</sup> “I give to a man ... and the one I omit is dearer to me.”<sup>29</sup> Al-Ḥasan was the only one who related ḥadīth from ‘Amr. Similarly, Muslim

15 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:710.

16 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):265; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 2(1):387

17 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):406–7; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 4(1):294–5.

18 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):12; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):207.

19 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1280.

20 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):330; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 4(1):378–9.

21 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1744.

22 ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā (d. ca. 83/702) was a prominent religious scholar in the city of al-Kūfā; Dhahabī, *Siyār*, 4:262–7.

23 P. 11 (Arabic), 14–15 (English).

24 4:215 (K. al-Riqāq, B. Dhahab al-ṣāliḥīn).

25 2:341–2 (K. al-Janā‘iz, B. Idha qala al-mushrik ‘inda ‘l-mawt).

26 1:40 (K. al-Imān).

27 Abū Ṭālib was the Prophet’s uncle and the father of ‘Alī. As the chief of the clan of Ḥashim, he protected the Prophet until his death around 619, although he does not seem to have converted to Islam; *EP*, 1:152–3.

28 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1166–7.

29 4:494 (K. al-Tawḥīd, B. Qawl Allāh inna al-insān khuliqa halū‘an ḏajūra).

included in his *Sahīh* the ḥadīth of Rāfi‘ b. ‘Amr al-Ghifārī<sup>30</sup> while ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ṣāmit<sup>31</sup> was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him. Muslim also included the ḥadīth of Abū Rifā‘a al-‘Adawi<sup>32</sup> despite the fact that Ḥumayd b. Hilāl al-‘Adawi<sup>33</sup> was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him. Muslim also included the ḥadīth of al-Agharr al-Muzāni<sup>34</sup> “My heart is covered”<sup>35</sup> and Abū Burda<sup>36</sup> was the only one to relate ḥadīth from him. Bukhārī and Muslim have many ḥadīth of this type in their books.<sup>37</sup> That indicates their belief that a transmitter sometimes emerges from being unknown and rejected (*majhūl mardūd*) through the relation of a single person from him. I discussed this earlier in Category 23. [Nevertheless] I have read through discovery (*wijādatan*) that Abū ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Andalusī said, “They consider everyone from whom only a single person transmits ḥadīth unknown, unless that person is famous for something other than transmitting ḥadīth, as Mālik b. Dīnār<sup>38</sup> was famous for asceticism and ‘Amr b. Ma‘di Karib<sup>39</sup> for valor.”

Regarding some of those whom we mentioned as having only a single transmitter, be aware that there is sometimes a dispute over whether that transmitter was truly alone. This is the case with Qudāma b. ‘Abd Allāh. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said<sup>40</sup> that Ḥumayd b. Kullāb<sup>41</sup> also related ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

An example of this Category from the Followers is Abu ‘l-‘Usharā’ al-Dārimī. So far as is known, no one but Ḥammād b. Salama related ḥadīth from him. Al-Ḥakim cited Muḥammad b. Abī Sufyān al-Thaqafī<sup>42</sup> as an example of a

30 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:482.

31 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):118; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):84.

32 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1657–8.

33 Abū Naṣr Ḥumayd b. Hilāl b. Suwayd al-‘Adawi (d. ca. 120/738) was one of the most respected ḥadīth transmitters in al-Baṣrà; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:309–11.

34 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:102.

35 8:72 (K. al-Dhikr wa-‘l-du‘ā’).

36 The *ism* of Abū Burda, the son of the famous Companion Abū Mūsa al-Aṣḥārī, is said to have been ‘Āmir (see below, Category 50). He served as judge in al-Kūfa and died around 104/722; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:343–6, 5:5–7.

37 As Prof. ‘Abd al-Rahmān points out, the examples in this paragraph were taken from Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *Shurūt al-a‘imma al-sitta* (bound with Ḥāzimī, *Shurūt al-a‘imma al-khamṣa*), ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī (Cairo, n.d.), 17.

38 Abū Yahyā Mālik b. Dīnār al-Sāmī al-Nājī (d. 131/748) was, as indicated here, a famous early ascetic; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:634.

39 Abū Thawr ‘Amr al-Zubaydī converted to Islam in the year 9/630 (or 10) when he accompanied a delegation to the Prophet. He distinguished himself in the conquest of Iraq, where he died around the year 21/642; Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):312; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):260; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1201–5.

40 *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1279.

41 I could not locate this transmitter in any of the sources I consulted.

42 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):103; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):275.

Follower in this Category and said that, so far as he knew, only Zuhri related ḥadīth from him. He said, "In the same way, Zuhri was alone in transmitting ḥadīth from some twenty Followers from whom no one else transmitted. The same was true of 'Amr b. Dīnār who was also alone in transmitting ḥadīth from a number of Followers. It was also true of Yaḥyā b. Sa'īd al-Anṣārī, Abū Ishaq al-Sabī'i, Hishām b. 'Urwa and others."<sup>43</sup> Al-Hākim elsewhere named some of the Followers from whom they alone transmitted.<sup>44</sup> Among those from whom 'Amr b. Dīnār was alone in transmitting ḥadīth were 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ma'bād<sup>45</sup> and 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Farrūkh.<sup>46</sup> 'Amr b. Abān b. Uthmān<sup>47</sup> and Sinān b. Abī Sinān al-Du'ālī<sup>48</sup> were among those from whom Zuhri was alone in transmitting ḥadīth. 'Abd Allāh b. Unays al-Anṣārī<sup>49</sup> was someone from whom Yaḥyā was alone in transmitting ḥadīth.

Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim cited al-Miswar b. Rifā'a al-Qurāzī<sup>50</sup> as an example of a follower of a Follower and said that only Mālik related ḥadīth from him. In the same way, Mālik was alone in relating from about ten of the teachers of Medina.<sup>51</sup> I fear that al-Hākim was relying on surmise and misapprehension in his placing some of the transmitters he mentioned in the position he put them. God knows best.

43 'Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 160.

44 What al-Hākim says in 'Ulūm al-ḥadīth (p. 160) is, "It is too much to mention them in this place."

45 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):350; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):285.

46 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):337; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):275.

47 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):315; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):220.

48 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):162-3; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(1):250-1.

49 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):45.

50 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):411; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):297-8.

51 'Ulūm al-ḥadīth, 160.

## Category 48

THOSE WHO ARE REFERRED TO BY DIFFERENT NAMES OR VARYING EPITHETS, SO THAT SOMEONE LACKING EXPERIENCE WITH THEM SUPPOSES THAT THESE NAMES OR EPITHETS REFER TO A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT PEOPLE

(*Ma'trifat man dhukira bi-asma' mukhtalifa aw nu'ūt muta'addida fa-ṣanna man lā khibra lahū bihā anna tilka 'l-asma' aw al-nu'ūt li-jamā'at mutafarriqīn*)

---

This is a difficult discipline, although the need for it is pressing. Through it misrepresentation (*tadlis*) is exposed and, indeed, most instances of it stem from attempts to misrepresent.<sup>1</sup> The expert 'Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa'īd al-Miṣrī<sup>2</sup> and others have composed books on this topic. An example of this is Muḥammad b. al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī,<sup>3</sup> the author of the Qur'ān commentary. He is the "Abu 'l-Naḍr" from whom Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Yasār related the ḥadīth of Tamīm al-Dārī<sup>4</sup> and 'Adī b. Baddā.<sup>5</sup> He is the "Hammād b. al-Sā'ib" from whom Abū Usāma<sup>6</sup> related the ḥadīth, "A hide becomes purified when it is tanned." He is also the "Abū Sa'īd" from whom 'Aṭīya al-Āwfi<sup>7</sup> related Qur'ān commentary. He misrepresented Kalbī by giving the false impression that he was Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī.

1 Scholars frequently referred to transmitters by varying forms of their name, either to disguise an unreliable transmitter's identity or to give the impression that they were quoting a number of different sources, when they depended heavily on a single transmitter; Ibn Daqīq al-Īd, *al-Iqtirāḥ fi bayān al-iṣṭilāḥ*, ed. Āmir Ḥasan Ṣabri (Beirut, 1417/1996), 218.

2 This would seem to be a reference to his *Iḍāḥ al-iṣhkāl fi 'l-riwāyāt* mentioned in Brockelmann, *GAL, Suppl.*, 1:950.

3 Kalbī (d. 146/763) was considered an unreliable transmitter, in fact a liar. Therefore those who found in his commentary an interpretation they wanted to use were tempted to conceal its connection to him so that it would not automatically be discredited. For Kalbī, see *EP*, 4:494–5; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:34–5.

4 The Companion Abū Ruqayya Tamīm b. Aws al-Dārī (d. 40/660) was best known for his expertise in the Qur'ān; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 2:442–8.

5 Ibn Ḥajar, *Isāba*, 2:467.

6 Hammād b. Usāma b. Zayd al-Kūfī (ca. 120/738–201/817) was a highly respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:277–9.

7 That Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Aṭīya b. Sa'īd b. Junāda al-Āwfi (d. 111/729) was a student of Kalbī is inherently improbable, although not impossible, given that 'Aṭīya, according to most authorities, predeceased Kalbī by three decades and appears as a major source in Kalbī's work. It may be worth noting that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (in his son's *Jārh*, 3[1]:383) introduces the assertion that 'Aṭīya took the commentary from Kalbī with the somewhat circumspect *balaghani*. He does not, by the way, mention that 'Aṭīya called him "Abū Sa'īd." For 'Aṭīya, see Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:30–1.

Another example is “Sālim,”<sup>8</sup> the transmitter from Abū Hurayra, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khuḍrī and ‘Ā’isha (God be pleased with them). He is “Sālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Madīnī,” “Sālim, the client of Mālik b. Awṣ b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣrī” and “Sālim, the client of Shaddād b. al-Hād al-Naṣrī.” In some relations he is called “Sālim, client of the two Naṣris,” in others “Sālim, the client of Mahrī;” in others “Sālim Sabalān;” in others “Abū ‘Abd Allāh, the client of Shaddād b. al-Hād;” in others “Sālim Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dawṣī;” and in some “Sālim, the client of the Daws.” ‘Abd al-Ghāni b. Sa‘īd mentioned all of that.

The expert al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] relates in his books from “Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Azharī,” “Ubayd Allāh b. Abi ’l-Fatḥ al-Fārisī” and “Ubayd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Uthmān al-Şayrafi,” all of whom were a single teacher of his. Similarly, he relates from “al-Hasan b. Muḥammad al-Khallāl,” “al-Hasan b. Abī Ṭālib” and “Abū Muḥammad al-Khallāl,” and all of these names represent a single person. He also relates from “Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Tanūkhi,” “‘Alī b. al-Muḥassīn al-Tanūkhi,” “the judge Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Alī b. al-Muḥassīn al-Tanūkhi,” and “the witness verifier (*mu‘addil*) ‘Alī b. Abī ‘Alī,” all of whom were the same person.<sup>9</sup> Al-Khaṭīb did that often. God knows best.

<sup>8</sup> Sālim is described as “one of the scholars of the city of Medina;” Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:595–6.

<sup>9</sup> Abu ’l-Qāsim al-Tanūkhi (365/976–447/1055) was a ḥadīth expert who served as a judge in a number of cities; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta’rikh Baghdađ*, 12:115.

## Category 49

### UNIQUE NAMES, NICKNAMES AND PAIDONYMICS OF THE COMPANIONS, TRANSMITTERS OF HADITH, AND OTHER SCHOLARS

(*Ma‘rifat al-mufradāt al-āhād min asmā’ al-Šahāba wa-ruwāt  
al-hadīth wa-’l-‘ulamā’ wa-alqābihim wa-kunāhūm*)

---

This is an estimable and interesting Category found in the books the experts composed on ḥadīth transmitters. They collected this material separately at the ends of the chapters of these books<sup>1</sup> and they also wrote monographs on it.

The book of Ahmad b. Hārūn al-Bardījī al-Bardha‘ī entitled *al-Asmā’ al-mufrada*<sup>2</sup> (*Unique Names*) is one of most famous works on the topic. More than one expert, including Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. Bukayr,<sup>3</sup> objected and made corrections to much of it. One criticism is that many of the names Bardījī claimed were unique were in reality borne by two, three or more people. According to our understanding of his aim, he intended to occupy himself only with the names (*asmā’*) of the Companions, scholars and transmitters of ḥadīth. So he received criticism for some of the unique appellations he cited on the basis that they are nicknames (*alqāb*) rather than actual names. For instance, “al-Ajlah al-Kindī”<sup>4</sup> (the bald member of the tribe of Kinda) was a nickname given to that man on account of his baldness and his name is Yaḥyā, and there are many Yaḥyās. Another example is Şughdī b. Sinān.<sup>5</sup> His name is ‘Umar, and “Şughdī” [a Şughdian; that is, a man from the town of Şughd, near Samarqand] is a nickname. Furthermore, there are other Şughdis, therefore this instance does not properly come under the heading of this Category. The truth is that this is a discipline in which it is difficult to make definitive statements and whoever does so runs the risk of error and criticism, because it is a vast and diffuse subject.

---

1 In the early biographical dictionaries, like Bukhārī’s *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr* and Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s *Kitāb al-Jarh wa-’l-ta’dil*, the more common names are treated first within the sections devoted to each letter of the alphabet.

2 The title of this work is given as *al-Tabaqāt fi ’l-asmā’ al-mufrada min asmā’ al-‘ulamā’ wa-ashhab al-hadīth* in Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:166–7.

3 Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd Allah b. Bukayr al-Baghdādī (327/938–388/998) composed a response to Bardījī’s book entitled *al-Radd wa-’l-ziyādāt ‘ala ’l-Tabaqāt fi ’l-asmā’ al-mufrada min asmā’ al-‘ulamā’ wa-ashhab al-hadīth*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:211–12.

4 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):68; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):346–7.

5 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):453–4.

Some of the useful examples of this are

*Ajmad* b. ‘Ujyān al-Ḥamdānī.<sup>6</sup> He was a Companion whom Ibn Yūnus<sup>7</sup> mentioned. We used to think it was “Ijjiyān,” following the pattern of “Illiyyān.” Then I found it in the handwriting of Ibn al-Furāt<sup>8</sup> – and he is authoritative – as “Ujyān,” on the pattern of “Sufyān.”

*Awṣaṭ* b. ‘Amr al-Bajalī.<sup>9</sup> A Follower.

*Tadūm* b. *Şubayḥ* al-Kalāqī: he transmitted ḥadīth from *Tubayc* b. ‘Āmir al-Kalāqī.<sup>10</sup> His name is also given as “Yadūm,” although the correct form is “Tadūm.”

*Jubayb* b. al-Ḥārith.<sup>11</sup> a Companion.

*Abu ’l-Jald Jilān* b. *Farwa* al-Akhbārī.<sup>12</sup> a Follower.

*Abu ’l-Ghuṣn al-Dujayn* b. Thābit.<sup>13</sup> it was claimed that he was the well-known *Juhā*.<sup>14</sup> It is more likely that he was somebody else.

*Zirr* b. *Hubaysh*:<sup>15</sup> the early Follower.

*Su‘ayr* b. *al-Khims*:<sup>16</sup> he was alone in regard to his name and the name of his father.

*Sandar* al-Khaṣī,<sup>17</sup> the client of *Zinbāc* al-Judhāmī:<sup>18</sup> he was a Companion.

The Companion *Shakal* b. *Humayd*.

6 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:144.

7 Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Aḥmad b. Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-‘Aql al-Ṣadaqī (281/894–347/958) wrote on the history of Egypt; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:357–8.

8 This seems to be a reference to the ḥadīth scholar *Abu ’l-Hasan Muḥammad* b. al-‘Abbas b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. al-Furāt al-Baghdādī (310/922–384/994). Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī described him as “authoritative in correct transmission and excellence of accuracy;” *Ta’rīkh Baghdād*, 3:122–3; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:495–6.

9 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):64; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):346. For the pronunciation of the *nisba* “Bajalī”; see Ibn al-‘Athīr, *Lubāb*, 1:121–2.

10 He was better known as *Tubayc* b. Imra’at *Ka'b* al-‘Aḥbār; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4: 413–14.

11 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:271.

12 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):251, s.n. *Jilān* b. *Abi Farwa*; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):547.

13 Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:172–3.

14 *Juhā* is the central figure in innumerable humorous stories; *El* 2:590–92.

15 The contemporaries of *Zirr* (d. ca. 81/700) regarded him as an expert in the Arabic language and the Qur’ān; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:166–70.

16 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):213; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):323.

17 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:688.

18 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:564–5.

Abū Rayḥāna *Sham‘ūn* b. Zayd:<sup>19</sup> his name is also given as “Shamghūn.” Abū Sa‘īd b. Yūnus said, “To my mind, ‘Shamghūn’ is more likely to be correct.” He was one of the great Companions.

The Companion Abū Umāma *Sudayy* b. ‘Ajlān.<sup>20</sup>

The Companion *Şunābiḥ* b. al-Aṣar. Whoever called him “Şunābihi” has erred.<sup>21</sup>

Abu ’l-Salīl *Durayb* b. Nuqayr b. Sumayr al-Qaysi al-Baṣrī:<sup>22</sup> he related from Mu‘ādhā al-Adawiya<sup>23</sup> and others. Nuqayr was his father. His name is also given as “Nufayr” and “Nufayl.”

*Azwaṇ* b. Zayd al-Raqāshi:<sup>24</sup> a good man and Follower.

*Qartha* b. Dabbī.<sup>25</sup>

*Kalada* b. Ḥanbal:<sup>26</sup> a Companion.

The Companion *Lubayy* b. Labā al-Asadi:<sup>27</sup> the first name is on the pattern of “Ubayy.” The second name is on the pattern of the word ‘aṣā (stick). Make a note of this name, for it is sometimes given incorrectly.

*Mustamirr* b. al-Rayyān:<sup>28</sup> he saw Anas [b. Mālik].

*Nubayshat* al-Khayr:<sup>29</sup> a Companion.

*Nawf* al-Bikālī:<sup>30</sup> a Follower belonging to the Bikāl, one of the subtribes of the Ḥimyar. Most of the scholars of ḥadīth [erroneously] pronounce it “Bakkālī.”

The Companion *Wābiṣa* b. Ma‘bad.<sup>31</sup>

*Hubayb* b. Mughfil.<sup>32</sup> a Companion.

19 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:711–12, s.n. *Sham‘ūn* b. *Yazid*.

20 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:736.

21 For this question, see Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:740; Suyūṭī, *Tadrib al-rāwī*, 2:272–3.

22 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):342; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 2(1):470.

23 Mu‘ādhā bint ‘Abd Allāh (d. ca. 83/702) was famed for her piety; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:508–9.

24 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):89; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 3(2):41.

25 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 3(2):147.

26 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1332–3.

27 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1340.

28 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):68; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 4(1):430–1.

29 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1523–4.

30 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):129; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 4(1):505.

31 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1563.

32 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1548.

*Hamadhān*,<sup>33</sup> the agent (*barid*) of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb: Ibn Bukayr and others gave it as “Hamadhān” and some of those who wrote about the book of Bardījī gave it as “Hamdān.”

Some unique paidonymics are

*Abu ’l-‘Ubaydayn*:<sup>34</sup> his name is Mu‘āwiya b. Sabra and he was one of the students of Ibn Mas‘ūd. He has two or three ḥadīth.

*Abu ’l-‘Usharā* al-Dārimī: he was mentioned above.

*Abu ’l-Mudilla*:<sup>35</sup> His name is not known. Al-A‘mash, Ibn ‘Uyayna and a number of others related ḥadīth from him. We do not know of anyone who agrees with the contention of Abu Nu‘aym [al-İsbahānī?] that his name is ‘Ubayd Allāh al-Madāni.

*Abū Murāya al-‘Ijli*:<sup>36</sup> his name is ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr. He was a Follower from whom Qatāda related ḥadīth.

*Abū Mu‘ayd*:<sup>37</sup> he is Hafṣ b. Ghaylān al-Hamdāni. He related ḥadīth from Makhūl<sup>38</sup> and others.

Some examples of unique nicknames are

*Safīna*,<sup>39</sup> the client and Companion of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): it is a unique nickname. The claim that his name is Mihrān is disputed.

*Mindal* b. ‘Alī:<sup>40</sup> this is the correct pronunciation according to al-Khaṭīb and others. Some also often give it as “Mandal.” It is a nickname and his name is ‘Amr.

*Sahnūn* b. Sa‘īd al-Tanūkhī al-Qayrawānī: he is author of the *al-Mudawwana* ([Legal] Register) on the school of Mālik. This is a unique nickname and his name is ‘Abd al-Salām.

<sup>33</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):255–6, s.n. Hamdān; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):121, s.n. Hamdān.

<sup>34</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):329–30; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):378.

<sup>35</sup> Bukhārī, *Kitāb al-Kunā* (Hyderabad, 1360), 74; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):444. Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ’s claim that al-A‘mash and Ibn ‘Uyayna transmitted from Abu ’l-Mudilla was regarded as a mistake; see Suyūtī, *Tadrīb al-rāwī*, 2:277.

<sup>36</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):154; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):118.

<sup>37</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):364; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):186.

<sup>38</sup> The Follower Makhūl b. Abī Muslim Shurāb al-Dimashqī (d. ca. 112/730) was considered the greatest Syrian scholar of his day; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:404.

<sup>39</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:684–5.

<sup>40</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):73; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):434–5.

Also of that ilk are *Muṭayyan* al-Ḥaḍramī,<sup>41</sup> *Mushkadāna* al-Ju‘fī<sup>42</sup> and others whom we will mention in the Category on nicknames (God – He is exalted – willing). He knows best.

---

<sup>41</sup> Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Sulaymān al-Ḥaḍramī (202/817–297/909) composed a *musnad* and *ta‘rikh*, neither of which seems to have survived. Abū Nu‘aym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn is said to have given him this nickname, meaning “muddy,” when he was a child; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:163.

<sup>42</sup> In Category 52, Ibn al-Ṣalāh explains that the nickname of Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar (d. 239/853) means “grain of musk” or “musk holder” in Persian. He is said to have received this name because he attended the class of Abū Nu‘aym wearing perfume; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:155–6.

Category 50  
NAMES AND PAIDONYMICS  
(*Ma‘rifat al-asmā’ wa-’l-kunā*)

---

There are many books on names and paidonymics, including the works of ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī,<sup>1</sup> Muslim,<sup>2</sup> Nasā’i<sup>3</sup> and the expert Abū Ḥākim al-Kabīr.<sup>4</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has several excellent short books on various aspects of this subject.<sup>5</sup> What is meant by the title of this Category is the identification of the names of the bearers of paidonymics. Writers on this topic arrange their books by paidronymic, identifying the names of the bearers of each. This is a much-needed discipline to which those knowledgeable in ḥadīth still direct their attention. They study it, discuss it amongst themselves and inveigh against those who are ignorant of it. I have formulated a fine new analysis of the material. I say: the bearers of paidonymics fall into several subcategories.

1. Those who are named by their paidronymic so that their name is their paidronymic and they have no other name. These fall into two subcategories.
  - (a). Those who have a paidronymic other than the paidronymic which is their name, so that it is as if the paidronymic has a paidronymic: that is interesting and surprising. This is like the case of *Abū Bakr* b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Hārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmī, one of the seven legal experts of Medina. He used to be called “the monk of the tribe of Quraysh.” His name is *Abū Bakr* and his paidronymic is *Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān*. The same is true of *Abū Bakr* b. Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Hazm al-Anṣārī.<sup>6</sup> His name is said to have been *Abū Bakr*

---

1 *Kitāb al-Asmā’ wa-’l-kunā*; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. Riḍā Tajaddud (n.p., n.d.), 286.

2 *Kitāb al-Kunā wa-’l-asmā’* (Damascus, 1984).

3 Ḥajjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 87.

4 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad (ca. 290/903–378/988), known as “al-Ḥākim al-Kabīr,” was recognized as the greatest scholar of ḥadīth of his era. His *Kitāb al-Asmā’ wa-’l-kunā* seems to be the work referred to here; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:203–4.

5 This description of Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s contribution to this discipline puzzled later writers (for example, Bulqīnī, *Mahāsin* 570). His *Kitāb al-Istighnā’ fī ma‘rifat al-mashhūrin min hamalat al-‘ilm bi-’l-kunā* (ed. ‘Abd Allāh Marḥūl al-Sawālima, 3 vols., Riyad, 1405/1985) is anything but *lātīf* and it seems to be the only work he wrote on the subject. As the editor of the *Istighnā’* has suggested (1:51), the confusion probably resulted from Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr’s adoption of the conceit of presenting each of the three sections of the work as a separate *kitāb* with its own introduction.

6 *Abū Bakr* b. Hazm (d. ca. 120/738) served as the governor and judge in the city of Medina; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:313–14.

and his paidronymic was *Abū Muḥammad*. Al-Khaṭīb said that there were no others like these two in that regard. It has also been said that [the aforementioned] Ibn Ḥazm had no paidronymic other than the one which was his name.

(b). Those who have no paidronymic other than the one which is their name: An example of this is *Abū Bilāl al-Asḥārī*, the transmitter from Sharīk and others. It was related from him that he said, “I do not have a name. My name and my paidronymic are the same.”<sup>7</sup> This is also the case of *Abū Ḥaṣīn b. Yahyā b. Sulaymān al-Rāzī*. A number of transmitters related ḥadīth from him, including *Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī*. *Abū Ḥātim* asked him, “Do you have a name?” and he replied, “No, my name and my paidronymic are the same.”<sup>8</sup>

2. Those who are known by their paidronymic and their name is not known and it is not known whether this appellation is their paidronymic or something else: one Companion exemplifying this is *Abū Anās al-Kinānī*.<sup>9</sup>

He is also given the gentilic “Dīlī,” from the tribe of Abu ’l-Aswad al-Dīlī. “Dīlī” occurs as “Du’alī” in the lineage (*nasab*) given by some of the experts in the Arabic language and others anomalously give it as “Du’ili.”

Other examples from the Companions are *Abū Muwayhiba*,<sup>10</sup> the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him), and *Abū Shayba al-Khudrī*,<sup>11</sup> who died in the siege of Constantinople and was buried there.

Examples from after the Companions are

*Abu ’l-Abyad*,<sup>12</sup> the transmitter from Anas b. Mālik.

*Abū Bakr b. Nāfi’*<sup>13</sup> – Nāfi’ was the client of Ibn ‘Umar; Mālik and others transmitted from him.

*Abu ’l-Najib*,<sup>14</sup> the client of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Amr b. al-Āṣ: his paidronymic is alternatively given as Abu ’l-Tujayb.

*Abū Ḥarb b. Abi ’l-Aswad al-Dīlī*.<sup>15</sup>

7 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):350.

8 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):364.

9 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥ*, 4:1605, s.n. *Abū Iyās*.

10 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥ*, 4:1764–5.

11 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥ*, 4:1690.

12 Bukhārī, *Kunā*, 8; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):336, 3(1):293, s.n. *Qisā*.

13 Bukhārī, *Kunā*, 14; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):343.

14 Mizzi, *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fi asmā’ al-rijāl*, ed. Bashshār ‘Awwād Ma’rūf, 35 vols (Beirut, 1406/1985–1413/1992), 34:340–1.

15 Bukhārī, *Kunā*, 23; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):358–9.

*Abū Ḥarīz al-Mawqifī*<sup>16</sup>—and al-Mawqif is a place in Egypt. Ibn Wahb and others transmitted ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

3. Those whose nickname is a paidronymic [in form] and who also bear other paidonymics and names. For example

‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (God be pleased with him): he was nicknamed *Abū Turāb* (father of earth) and his paidronymic was *Abū ’l-Ḥasan*.

*Abū ’l-Zinād* ‘Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān: his paidronymic was *Abū ’Abd al-Rahmān*, and *Abū ’l-Zinād* (father of the fire sticks) was a nickname. The expert Abu ’l-Faḍl al-Falakī, according to what we read from him, said that ‘Abd Allāh b. Dhakwān used to be angered by the nickname “*Abū ’l-Zinād*.” He was a versatile scholar.

*Abū ’l-Rijāl* Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Anṣārī:<sup>17</sup> his paidronymic was *Abū ’Abd al-Rahmān*, and *Abū ’l-Rijāl* (father of the men) is a nickname he was given because he had ten children, all of them “men.”

*Abū Tumayla* Yaḥyā b. Wādīḥ al-Anṣārī al-Marwāzī:<sup>18</sup> his paidronymic was *Abū Muḥammad*, and *Abū Tumayla* was a nickname. Yaḥyā b. Ma’īn and others endorsed his reliability and *Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī* criticized<sup>19</sup> Bukhārī for including him in his book of weak transmitters.

The expert *Abū ’l-Ādhān* ʿUmar b. Ibrāhīm:<sup>20</sup> he had the paidronymic *Abū Bakr* and he was nicknamed *Abū ’l-Ādhān* (father of the ears) because he had big ears.

The expert *Abū ’l-Shaykh* ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-İsbahānī: his paidronymic was *Abū Muḥammad*, and *Abū ’l-Shaykh* was a nickname.

The expert *Abū Hāzim* ʿUmar b. Aḥmad al-‘Abdūwī:<sup>21</sup> his paidronymic was *Abū Ḥafṣ*, and *Abū Hāzim* was a nickname. We learned that from Falaki’s book on nicknames.<sup>22</sup> God knows best.

16 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):362.

17 Bukhārī, *Kuṇā*, 87; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):317.

18 Abū Tumayla died around the year 190/806; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:210–11.

19 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):194.

20 Abu ’l-Ādhān died in the year 290/903 at the age of sixty-three years; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 81–2.

21 Abū Hāzim was a prominent scholar of ḥadīth who died in 417/1026; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:333–6. The *nisba* “*Abdūwī*” is also pronounced “*Abdawī*” and “*Abdūyī*;” see Ibn al-Aṭīr, *Lubāb*, 2:313.

22 *Ma’rifat alqāb al-muḥaddithin*; Ḥāfiẓ Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:col. 1739.

4. Those who have two or more paidonymics. Some examples are

‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Jurayj: he had two paidonymics: *Abū Khālid* and *Abu ’l-Walid*.

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Ḥafṣ al-‘Umari,<sup>23</sup> the brother of ‘Ubayd Allāh: it is related that he had the paidronymic *Abu ’l-Qāsim*. He renounced it and adopted *Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān* as his paidronymic.

Our teacher Manṣūr b. Abi ’l-Maṭālī al-Nisābūri, the grandson of Furāwī, had three paidonymics: *Abū Bakr*, *Abu ’l-Fatḥ* and *Abu ’l-Qāsim*. God knows best.

5. Those whose name is well known, but whose paidronymic is disputed so that two or more different paidonymics are given for them. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Aṭa’ al-Ibrāhīmī al-Harawī<sup>24</sup> – one of the later scholars – has a brief work on this.

Usāma b. Zayd, the dear friend of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him): his paidronymic is variously given as *Abū Zayd*, *Abū Muḥammad*, *Abū ‘Abd Allāh* and *Abū Khārijā*.

Ubayy b. Ka'b: *Abu ’l-Mundhir* and *Abu ’l-Tufayl* are given.

Qabiṣa b. Dhu’ayb:<sup>25</sup> *Abū Ishāq* and *Abū Sa‘id* are given.

Al-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abi Bakr al-Ṣiddiq: *Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān* and *Abū Muḥammad* are given.

Sulaymān b. Bilāl al-Madāni:<sup>26</sup> *Abū Bilāl* and *Abū Muḥammad* are given.

Some of those mentioned in this subcategory could in actuality also be placed in the previous one.

6. Those whose paidronymic is known and whose name is disputed. Examples of this from among the Companions are

23 ‘Abd Allāh (d. 171/787), unlike his brother ‘Ubayd Allāh, was not unreservedly endorsed as a transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:339–41.

24 Ibrāhīmī (d. 476/1083) was a transmitter of ḥadīth and a preacher; Ibn al-Athīr, *Lubāb*, 1:24.

25 Qabiṣa was born in the year 8/629 and rose to hold high offices under the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd al-Malik. He was a prolific transmitter of ḥadīth and died in 86/705 (or 87 or 88); Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:282–3.

26 Sulaymān (100/719–172/788) was an expert in the ḥadīth of the Medinese; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 7:425–7.

*Abū Baṣra* al-Ghifārī:<sup>27</sup> his paidronymic is pronounced in the same way as the city “al-Baṣra.” It is said that his name is Jamīl b. Baṣra. Ḥumayl is also given and it is more likely to be correct.

*Abū Juḥayfa* al-Suwā’ī:<sup>28</sup> his name is variously given as Wahb b. ‘Abd Allāh and Wahb Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh.

*Abū Hurayra* al-Dawsī: his name and the name of his father are hotly disputed, more than the name of anyone else before or after the advent of Islam. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr<sup>29</sup> said that there are about twenty claims about his name and that of his father and that, because of the great confusion, in his opinion nothing reliable can be established regarding his name, except that one can feel confidence that ‘Abd Allāh or ‘Abd al-Raḥmān was his name during the Islamic era. It is said on the authority of Muḥammad b. Ishaq that his name was ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sakhr and a number of those who have written on names and paidonymics relied on that. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim said, “To our mind, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sakhr is the opinion regarding the name of Abū Hurayra which is most likely to be correct.”

Among those who lived after the Companions are

*Abū Burda* b. Abī Mūsā al-Ash‘arī: Most experts believe that his name was ‘Āmir. [Yaḥyā] b. Ma‘īn said that his name was al-Hārith.

*Abū Bakr* b. ‘Ayyāsh,<sup>30</sup> the transmitter of the Qur‘ān recension of ‘Āsim: his name is disputed and eleven opinions regarding it are given. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said that if it is true that he had a name, it was Shu‘ba and none other; and this is the one which Abū Zur‘a [al-Rāzī] regarded as correct.<sup>31</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said, “It was said that his name was his paidronymic. That – God willing – is the view most likely to be correct because it is related from Abū Bakr al-‘Ayyāsh himself that he said, ‘I have no name other than Abū Bakr.’”<sup>32</sup> God knows best.

7. Those whose paidronymic and name are both disputed, and that is uncommon. An example of this is Safina, the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be

27 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 2(1):123–4, s.n. Ḥumayl; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):436–7, s.n. Baṣra; 1(1):517, s.n. Jamīl; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:184, s.n. Baṣra; 1:405–6, s.n. Ḥumayl; 4:1611–12, s.n. Abū Baṣra.

28 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1619–20.

29 *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1768–72.

30 Abū Bakr al-‘Ayyāsh (95/714 or 97–193/809) was respected as an expert in the Qur‘ān, but is said to have made many mistakes in his ḥadīth transmissions; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:10–11.

31 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):349.

32 *Iṣtighnā*, 1:445.

upon him). ‘Umayr, Ṣalih and Mihrān are variously given as his name. His paidronymic is given variously as Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān and Abu ‘l-Bakhtari. God knows best.

8. Those whose paidronymic and name are not disputed and are both known and famous. Examples of this, among many others, are the imāms of the law schools, those bearing the paidronymic Abū ‘Abd Allāh, [that is,] Mālik, Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi‘ī and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal; and Abū Ḥanifa al-Nu‘mān b. Thābit.

9. Those who are famous under their paidronymic, rather than their name, despite the fact that their name is not unknown to those knowledgeable in ḥadīth. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has a fine work concerning people like this who lived after the generation of the Companions.<sup>33</sup> Examples of this are:

*Abū Idrīs al-Khawlānī*: His name is ‘Ā’idh Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh.

*Abū Iṣhāq al-Sabī‘ī*: His name is ‘Amr b. ‘Abd Allāh.

*Abu ‘l-Ash‘ath al-Ṣan‘ānī*<sup>34</sup> – his gentilic refers to the village of Ṣan‘ā near Damascus: his name is Sharāḥil b. Āda. Some pronounce his father’s name as “Udda.”

*Abu ‘l-Duhā Muslim b. Ṣubayḥ*.<sup>35</sup>

The ascetic *Abū Ḥazīm al-‘Araj*, the transmitter from Sahl b. Sa‘d and others: his name is Salama b. Dīnār.

The examples of this are innumerable. God knows best.

33 This appears to be a reference to the third section of his *Istighnā‘*.

34 Abu ‘l-Ash‘ath is said to have died after the year 100/719; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:357–9.

35 Abu ‘l-Duhā died around the year 100/719; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:71.

## Category 51

### THE PAIDONYMICS OF THOSE BETTER KNOWN UNDER THEIR NAME, RATHER THAN THEIR PAIDONYMIC (*Ma'rifat kuna 'l-ma'rūfīn bi-'l-asmā' dūna 'l-kunā'*)

---

In one respect, this Category is the opposite of the previous one. This material, in contrast, is typically arranged by name and then the paidonymics of the people bearing that name are identified. In another respect, this Category does accord with the previous one because it is [sometimes] treated as one of the subcategories of that Category since this Category is one of the subcategories of the bearers of paidonymics. Rarely does anyone write about this topic on its own, although we did read that Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān al-Bustī composed a book on it.<sup>1</sup> By way of providing examples, let us gather groups of transmitters under a single paidronymic to clarify the basic concept.

Some of the Companions (God be pleased with all of them) of this type bearing the paidronymic “Abū Muḥammad” are

Talḥa b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Taymī<sup>2</sup>  
‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf al-Zuhri  
al-Ḥasan b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib al-Hāshimi  
Thābit b. Qays b. al-Shammās al-Anṣārī<sup>3</sup>  
‘Abd Allāh b. Zayd al-Anṣārī,<sup>4</sup> who was known for the call to prayer  
Ka'b b. 'Ujra<sup>5</sup>  
al-Ash'ath b. Qays<sup>6</sup>  
Ma'qil b. Sinān al-Ashja'i<sup>7</sup>  
‘Abd Allāh b. Ja'far b. Abī Ṭālib<sup>8</sup>  
‘Abd Allāh b. Buḥayna<sup>9</sup>  
‘Abd Allāh b. 'Amr b. al-Āṣ  
‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq  
Jubayr b. Muṭ'im<sup>10</sup>  
al-Fadl b. al-'Abbās b. 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib

---

1 *Kitāb Kunā man yu'rafū bi-'l-asāmī; Yaqūt, Mu'jam al-buldān*, 1:616.

2 Talḥa was a very early convert to Islam and a central figure in the early struggles. He died while leading a revolt against the caliph 'Alī in 36/656; *EP*, 10:161–2.

3 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 1:200–3.

4 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 3:912–13.

5 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 3:1321.

6 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 1:133–5.

7 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 3:1431–2.

8 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 3:880–2.

9 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 3:871.

10 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 1:232–3.

Huwayṭib b. ‘Abd al-‘Uzzay<sup>11</sup>

Mahmūd b. al-Rabī‘

‘Abd Allāh b. Thaqaba b. Ṣuṣayr<sup>12</sup>

Some of the Companions bearing the paidronymic “Abū ‘Abd Allāh” are

al-Zubayr b. al-‘Awwām<sup>13</sup>

al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib

Salmān al-Fārisī

‘Āmir b. Rabī‘a al-‘Adawī<sup>14</sup>

Hudhayfa b. al-Yamān

Ka'b b. Mālik<sup>15</sup>

Rāfi‘ b. Khadīj<sup>16</sup>

‘Umāra b. Ḥazm<sup>17</sup>

al-Nu‘mān b. Bashir

Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh

‘Uthmān b. Ḥunayf

Ḥāritha b. al-Nu‘mān<sup>18</sup>

The following seven are Ansarites:

Thawbān,<sup>19</sup> the client of the Messenger of God (God be pleased with him)

al-Mughīra b. Shu‘ba

Shurahbil b. Ḥasana<sup>20</sup>

‘Amr b. al-‘Āṣ

Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Jahsh

Ma‘qil b. Yasār al-Muzāni<sup>21</sup>

‘Amr b. ‘Āmir al-Muzāni<sup>22</sup>

Some of the Companions bearing the paidronymic “Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān” are

‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd

<sup>11</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 1:399–400.

<sup>12</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 3:876.

<sup>13</sup> Al-Zubayr was a cousin of the Prophet and a nephew of his wife Khadija. Like Ṭalḥa, he died in the Battle of the Camel in 36/656; *EP*, 4:1235–6.

<sup>14</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 2:790–91.

<sup>15</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 3:1323–6.

<sup>16</sup> Rafī‘ b. Khadīj was a prominent Medinese religious authority who died in the year 74/693 at the age of eighty-six; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:181–3.

<sup>17</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 3:1141.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 1:306–7.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 1:218.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 2:698–9.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 3:1432–3.

<sup>22</sup> There seems to have been no such person. Prof. ‘Abd al-Rahmān suggests that Abū ‘Abd Allāh ‘Amr b. ‘Awf al-Muzāni (Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣlāḥāt*, 3:1196) was meant; *Muqaddima*, 582.

Mu‘ādh b. Jabal<sup>23</sup>

Zayd b. al-Khaṭṭāb,<sup>24</sup> the brother of ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb

‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb

Muhammad b. Maslama al-Anṣārī<sup>25</sup>

‘Uwaym b. Sā‘ida<sup>26</sup>

Zayd b. Khālid al-Juhāni<sup>27</sup>

Bilal b. al-Hārith al-Muzānī<sup>28</sup>

Mu‘āwiya b. Abī Sufyān

al-Hārith b. Hishām al-Makhzūmī<sup>29</sup>

al-Miswar b. Makhrama<sup>30</sup>

There are other opinions regarding the paidronymic of some of those whom we have mentioned above. God knows best.

23 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1402–7.

24 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:550–3.

25 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1377–8.

26 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1248.

27 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:549–50.

28 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:183.

29 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:301–5.

30 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1399–1400.

## Category 52

### NICKNAMES OF TRANSMITTERS OF HADITH AND OTHER PEOPLE MENTIONED WITH THE TRANSMITTERS

(*Ma'rifat alqāb al-muḥaddithīn wa-man dhukira ma'ahum*)

There are many instances of this and someone not acquainted with them may almost come to think that the nicknames are names (*asāmi*) and thus place a person referred to by his name in one place and the same person referred to by his nickname in another place, as two separate individuals. This befell many writers. The expert Abū Bakr Ahmād b. 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Shirāzī<sup>1</sup> and the expert Abu 'l-Fadl b. al-Falakī<sup>2</sup> were among those who composed works on this subject. Nicknames are subcategorized into those which may permissibly be applied – these are the ones the person nicknamed does not object to – and those which are impermissible – and these are the ones the person nicknamed dislikes. The following is an illustrative sample of both types.

We heard that the expert 'Abd al-Ghāni b. Sa'īd said, "Two distinguished men to whom ugly nicknames stuck were Mu'āwiya b. 'Abd al-Karīm *al-Dāll* (the misguided)<sup>3</sup> – he went astray only on the road to Mecca – and 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammād *al-Da'if* (the weak)<sup>4</sup> – he was only physically weak and not weak in his ḥadīth." A third is 'Ārim (vicious) Abu 'l-Nu'mān Muhammād b. al-Fadl al-Sadūsī and he was a pious man who was far from vicious.

*Al-Da'if* [that is, 'Abd Allāh b. Muhammād] is Abū Muhammād al-Tarsūsī. He heard ḥadīth from Blind Abū Mu'āwiya<sup>5</sup> and others. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī wrote ḥadīth from him<sup>6</sup> and Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān claimed that he was [antiphrasistically]<sup>7</sup> called "*al-Da'if*" on account of his exactitude and accuracy.<sup>8</sup>

*Ghundar* (troublemaker) was the nickname of Abū Bakr<sup>9</sup> Muhammād b. Ja'far al-Baṣrī. The reason for it which we heard was that Ibn Jurayj came to al-Baṣra

1 The title of the book of Abū Bakr al-Shirāzī (d. 407/1016) is given as *Alqāb al-ruwāt* in Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 157 and *Kitāb Alqāb al-muḥaddithīn* in Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:225.

2 *Muntahā al-kamāl fi ma'rifat al-rijāl*; Ḥājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:col. 1858.

3 *Bukhārī*, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):337; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):381–2. The epithet *dāll* often refers to irregularity in religious doctrine.

4 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):163.

5 Abū Mu'āwiya Muhammād b. Khāzīm al-Kūfi (113/731–194/810 or 195) was considered to be particularly strong in the ḥadīth of his teacher al-A' mash; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:73–8.

6 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):163.

7 Suyūtī, *Tadrīb al-rāwī*, 2:290.

8 *Thiqāt*, 8:362.

9 The other sources I consulted give his *kunya* as "Abū 'Abd Allāh."

and transmitted the ḥadīth of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī to the Baṣrans. They censured him for that and stirred up trouble.<sup>10</sup> Muḥammad b. Ja‘far agitated a lot and Ibn Jurayj said to him, “Be quiet, *ghundar!*” The Hejazians term someone who incites discord *ghundar*. There were other “Ghundars” after him, each of whom bore it as a nickname, including

Abu ’l-Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Rāzī, Ghundar:<sup>11</sup> he transmitted ḥadīth from the expert Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and others.

Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ja‘far al-Baghdādī, Ghundar,<sup>12</sup> the widely traveled expert: the expert Abū Nu‘aym [al-İsbahānī] and others transmitted ḥadīth from him.

Abu ’l-Ṭayyib Muḥammad b. Ja‘far b. Durrān al-Baghdādī, Ghundar:<sup>13</sup> he transmitted ḥadīth from Abū Khalifa al-Jumāḥī<sup>14</sup> and others.

There were others who bore that nickname who were not named “Muḥammad b. Ja‘far.”

- *Ghunjār* (Persian: *ghanjār*, rouge) was the nickname of an early transmitter, Abū Aḥmad Īsā b. Mūsā al-Taymī al-Bukhārī.<sup>15</sup> He transmitted ḥadīth from Mālik, [Sufyān] al-Thawrī and others. He was nicknamed “Ghunjār” because of his rosy cheeks.
- Another “Ghunjār” was a later transmitter, namely the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Bukhārī.<sup>16</sup> He was the author of *Ta’rīkh Bukhārā*<sup>17</sup> (*History of Bukhara*) and died in the year 412 [1021 AD]. God knows best.
- *Şā‘iqā* (thunderbolt): he was the expert Abū Yaḥyā Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Raḥīm.<sup>18</sup> Bukhārī and others transmitted ḥadīth from him. The expert Abū ‘Ali [al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Ali al-Nisābūrī] said that he was nicknamed

<sup>10</sup> Apparently the Baṣrans felt that it was presumptuous for an out-of-towner to try to teach them the ḥadīth of their local hero.

<sup>11</sup> Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:217, no. 149.

<sup>12</sup> Ghundar al-Warrāq died in 370/981; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:214–15, no. 145.

<sup>13</sup> He was a Sufi who moved to Egypt and died there in 357/968 or 358; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:215–16, no. 146.

<sup>14</sup> Abū Khalifa al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥubāb al-Jumāḥī (206/821–305/917) was an expert in ḥadīth as well as secular literature; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 14:7–11.

<sup>15</sup> He was a prominent transmitter in Bukhara who died at the end of 186/802; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:487–8.

<sup>16</sup> Not much seems to have been recorded about this Ghunjār (337/948–412/1021). He is said to have received his nickname on account of his great interest in the ḥadīth of the earlier Ghunjār, although he was not, of course, a student of his; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:353.

<sup>17</sup> Ḥājjī Khalifa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 286.

<sup>18</sup> Şā‘iqā (185/801–255/869) was a respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:295–6.

“Şāfiqa” because of his learning and the intensity of his study and pursuit [of ḥadīth].

- *Shabāb* (youthfulness) was the nickname of Khalifa b. Khayyāt al-‘Uṣfūrī,<sup>19</sup> the author of *al-Tārīkh* (*History*). He heard ḥadīth from [the earliest] Ghundar and others.
- *Zunayj* (little black man) was the nickname of Abū Ghassān Muḥammad b. ‘Amr al-Rāzī.<sup>20</sup> Muslim and others related ḥadīth from him.
- *Rusta* (Persian: sprout) was the nickname of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Umar al-İsbahānī.<sup>21</sup>
- *Sunayd* was the nickname of al-Husayn b. Dāwūd al-Miṣṣīṣī,<sup>22</sup> the author of the Qur’ān commentary. The experts Abū Zur‘a [al-Rāzī], Abū Ḥātim [al-Rāzī] and others related ḥadīth from him.
- *Bundār* (Persian: wholesaler) was the nickname of Muḥammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī.<sup>23</sup> Bukhārī, Muslim and many others transmitted ḥadīth from him. Ibn al-Falakī said that he was given this nickname because he was the “wholesaler” of ḥadīth.
- *Qayṣar* (caesar) was the nickname of the well-known Abu ’l-Naḍr Hāshim b. al-Qāsim.<sup>24</sup> Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and others transmitted ḥadīth from him.
- *Al-Akhfash* (dim-eyes) was the nickname of several people, including the grammarian Aḥmad b. ʿImrān al-Baṣrī. An early scholar of ḥadīth, he transmitted from Zayd b. al-Hubāb<sup>25</sup> and others. He has a book entitled *Gharib al-Muwaṭṭa'* (*Rare Words in Mālik's Muwaṭṭa'*). There were three famous Akhfashes who were grammarians.

The earliest was Abu ’l-Khaṭṭāb ‘Abd al-Ḥamid b. ‘Abd al-Majīd<sup>26</sup> and he was the one Sibawayhi<sup>27</sup> mentioned in his *Kitāb* (*Book*).

<sup>19</sup> Abū ‘Amr Khalifa b. Khayyāt al-‘Uṣfūrī (d. 240/854) is best known for the *Tārīkh* (ed. Suhayl Zakkār, 2 vols, Damascus, 1967–8), which Ibn al-Şalāh mentioned, and his *Kitāb al-Tabaqāt* (ed. Suhayl Zakkār, Damascus, 1966; ed. Akram Dīyār al-‘Umari, Baghdad, 1967); Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:110; *EP*, 3:838–9.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(1):34.

<sup>21</sup> Abu ’l-Faraj ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar al-İsbahānī (d. 250/864) was an important student of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Mahdi; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:242–3.

<sup>22</sup> Sunayd died in 226/841; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:627–8. “Sunayd” would appear to be the diminutive form of *sanad*, prop, support, etc. Nothing I have read sheds any light on the origin or exact sense of this unusual nickname.

<sup>23</sup> Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Bashshār al-Baṣrī (167/784–252/866) was one of the most prominent transmitters of ḥadīth in his day; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:144–9.

<sup>24</sup> Abu ’l-Naḍr Hāshim b. al-Qāsim al-Laythī al-Khurāsānī (134/752–207/822) was an important transmitter in Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:545–9.

<sup>25</sup> Zayd (ca. 130/748–203/819) left his hometown of Marv and traveled extensively to collect ḥadīth. It is said that he even reached al-Andalus; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:393–5.

<sup>26</sup> Little seems to have been recorded about the grammarian known as al-Akhfash al-Akbar; Qiftī, *Inbāh al-ruwāt*, 2:158–9.

<sup>27</sup> Sibawayhi (d. ca. 180/796) was the father of Arabic grammar; *EP*, 9:524–31; Sezgin, *GAS*, 9:51–63.

The second was Abu 'l-Hasan Sa'īd b. Mas'ada<sup>28</sup> and he is the one who related *Kitāb Sibawayh* (*The Book of Sibawayh*) and was a student of Sibawayh.

The third is Abu 'l-Hasan 'Alī b. Sulaymān,<sup>29</sup> the student of the two grammarians bearing the paidronymic "Abu 'l-'Abbās," namely Aḥmad b. Yaḥyā,<sup>30</sup> nicknamed "Tha'lab," and Muḥammad b. Yazīd,<sup>31</sup> nicknamed "al-Mubarrad."

- *Murabba'* (man with bushy eyebrows) was the expert Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Baghdādī.<sup>32</sup>
- *Jazara* (carrot) was the nickname of the expert Ṣalīḥ b. Muḥammad al-Baghdādī.<sup>33</sup> He was nicknamed this because he heard from one of his teachers what was related from 'Abd Allāh b. Busr to the effect that he used to employ a *kharaza* (bead) as a magical charm [to cure sick people]. He misread it, saying, *jazara*, and it stuck to him. He was a wag about whom humorous stories are related.
- *'Ubayd al-'Ijl* (little believer, the calf) was the nickname of the expert Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Husayn b. Muḥammad b. Hātim al-Baghdādī.
- *Kilaja* (a unit of weight equaling about five-and-three-quarter pounds) is the expert Muḥammad b. Ṣalīḥ al-Baghdādī.<sup>34</sup>
- *Mā Ghammahū* (he – or it? – did not sadden him), consisting of the negation [that is, *mā*] and the verb *ghamma*, was the nickname of 'Allān b. 'Abd al-Šamad. He is the expert 'Alī b. al-Hasan b. 'Abd al-Šamad al-Baghdādī.<sup>35</sup> The two nicknames are combined and he is called "'Allān Mā Ghammahū." We heard that Yaḥyā b. Ma'īn gave these five Baghdadis<sup>36</sup> their nicknames and they were early students of his and experts in ḥadīth.

28 Known as al-Akhfash al-Awsat (d. 215/830), he wrote works on the vocabulary of the ḥadīth and Qur'ān; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:80; 9:68–9.

29 Al-Akhfah al-Āṣghar (ca. 235/849–315/927) lived in Baghdad and was an expert in grammar and lexicography; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:174; 9:161.

30 Tha'lab (200/815–291/904) was one of the most celebrated grammarians of his age; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:141–7; 9:140–2.

31 The grammarian al-Mubarrad (210/826–285/898) was born in al-Baṣra and spent most of his life teaching in Baghdad, where he and Tha'lab competed for dominance; *EP* 7:279–82.

32 Murabba'<sup>c</sup> (d. 256/870) was a prominent student of Yaḥyā b. Ma'īn; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rikh Baghdaḍ*, 1:388–9. Lane writes that the epithet "*murabba'*" is applied to "a man whose eyebrows have much hair; as though he had four eyebrows;" *Lexicon sv.*

33 Jazara was born in Baghdad in 205/821. He moved to Bukhara in 266/880 and lived there until his death in 293/906; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 14:23–33.

34 Kilaja (or perhaps Kaylaja) died in Mecca in 291/904; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:524–6.

35 He was a minor transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 289/902. He is said to "have had many ḥadīth but little character." His nickname is sometimes given as "Mā Ghammahū;" Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 13:429.

36 That is, Murabba'<sup>c</sup>, Jazara, 'Ubayd al-'Ijl, Kilaja and Mā Ghammahū; see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Ta'rikh Baghdaḍ*, 1:388.

- The famous *Sajjāda* (prayer rug) was al-Hasan b. Ḥammād.<sup>37</sup> He heard ḥadīth from Waki' and others.
- Mushkadāna* – its meaning in Persian is “grain of musk” or “musk holder” – was the nickname of ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Umar b. Muḥammad b. Abān.
- Muṭayyan* (muddy) is the nickname of Abū Ja‘far al-Haḍramī. Abū Nu‘aym al-Faḍl b. Dukayn addressed *Mushkadāna* and *Muṭayyan* with these nicknames and they stuck.
- ‘Abdān (two “Abds”) is the nickname of a number of transmitters, the earliest of whom was ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Uthmān al-Marwāzī,<sup>38</sup> the student of Ibn al-Mubārak and the main transmitter from him. We heard from Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir al-Maqdīsī that he was called “‘Abdān” because his paidronymic was Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān and his name was ‘Abd Allāh, so the two “Abds” came together in his paidronymic and name. That is not correct. Rather, his nickname is due to the way the common people alter and fracture the name of a person when he is young and similar practices. In the same way, for “‘Alī,” they say “Allān; for Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulāmī<sup>39</sup> and others, they say “Hamdān;” and for Wahb b. Baqīya al-Wāsiṭī,<sup>40</sup> they say “Wahbān.” God knows best.

37 Abū ‘Alī al-Hasan b. Ḥammād al-Baghdādī (d. 241/855) seems to have been a well-respected scholar of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:392–3.

38 ‘Abdān (ca. 140/757–221/836) was one of the greatest ḥadīth scholars of his day in Marv; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:270–72.

39 Hamdān (182/798–264/878) was a well-traveled transmitter of ḥadīth from Khurāṣān; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:384–8.

40 Wahbān was a scholar of ḥadīth who died in Wāsiṭ in 239/854; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:462–4.

## Category 53

### HOMOGRAPHIC NAMES AND GENTILICS, AND RELATED MATTERS

(*Ma'rifat al-mu'talif wa-'l-mukhtalif min al-asmā'*  
*wa-'l-ansāb wa-yalṭahīqu bihā*)

---

This Category concerns those names and gentilics which are uniform – that is, agree – in regard to their written form but differ in their pronunciation.<sup>1</sup> This is an exalted discipline and those transmitters who are ignorant of it stumble often and never want for someone to make them feel shame. This information is diffuse and there is no general rule to which one can make recourse for most of it. Exactness is attained only by mastering specific data. Many useful books have been written on this Category and one of the most complete, despite its shortcomings, is Abū Naṣr b. Mākūla's *Ikmāl*. The following are some of the oft-mentioned things which come under the heading of accurately recording words. Accuracy in this area consists of two subcategories, the general and the particular.<sup>2</sup>

#### Subcategory 1

Examples are *Sallām* and *Salām*. All of the instances of this name which you will encounter will be "Sallām," except five and they are

- Salām, the father of the Companion 'Abd Allāh b. Salām al-Isrā'ili.<sup>3</sup>
- Salām, the father of Muḥammad b. Salām al-Bikandi al-Bukhāri,<sup>4</sup> the teacher of Bukhāri: Al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] and Ibn Mākūla mention him solely as "Salām." The author of *al-Maṭāli'*<sup>5</sup> (*The Rising Places*) said, "Some pronounce it 'Salām' and others pronounce it 'Sallām,' and the latter is more common." "Salām" is better established and it is what Ghunjār [that is, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Bukhāri] mentioned in his *Ta'rīkh Bukhārā*, and he knew the inhabitants of his region best.

---

1 That is, the instances where the basic consonantal skeletons of the words are the same, or very similar, so the words have to be differentiated by close attention to vocalization and pointing.

2 It will be seen that by "the particular" Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ means the instances of homography which occur in the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik and the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of Bukhāri and Muslim.

3 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *İstī'āb*, 3:921–3.

4 Muḥammad b. Salām was a sedulous student of ḥadīth who died in 225/830; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:628–30.

5 This is an allusion to Abū Ishaq Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf, known as Ibn Qurqūl (505/1111–569/1174); Brockelmann, *GAL*, 1:370–1; *Suppl.* 1:633. His *Maṭāli'* *al-anwār* was an abridgement of al-Qaḍī Iyāḍ's *Mashāiq al-anwār*; see Hājjī Khalīfa, *Kashf*, 2:cols. 1687, 1715.

- Salām b. Muḥammad b. Nāhiḍ al-Maqdīsi: the expert Abū Ṭālib<sup>6</sup> and Ṭabarānī related ḥadīth from him and Ṭabarānī called him “Salāma.”<sup>7</sup>
- Salām, the grandfather of the Mu'tazilite speculative theologian Abū 'Ali Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb b. Salām al-Jubbā'ī.<sup>8</sup>
- Al-Mubarrad said in his *Kāmil*, “There is no Arab named ‘Salām,’ except the father of [the Companion] ‘Abd Allāh b. Salām and Salām b. Abi ’l-Ḥuqayq.”<sup>9</sup> Others add Salām b. Mishkam,<sup>10</sup> a wine merchant who lived in pre-Islamic times. However, the well-known form of his name is “Sallām.” God knows best.

‘Umāra and ‘Imāra: we do not have an “‘Imāra” except the Companion Ubayy b. ‘Umāra<sup>11</sup> and some even pronounce his name “‘Umāra.” Everyone else is “‘Umāra.” God knows best.

*Kariz* and *Kurayz*: Abū 'Ali al-Ghassānī<sup>12</sup> related in his book *Taqyid al-muhmal* (*Fixing Unpointed Words*) from Muḥammad b. Waddāh<sup>13</sup> that “Kariz” occurs in the tribe of Khuzā'a and “Kurayz” is used in the tribe of ‘Abd Shams b. ‘Abd Manāf. “Kurayz” is also found elsewhere. We do not add Ayyūb b. Kurayz,<sup>14</sup> the transmitter from ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Ghanm,<sup>15</sup> to the “Karizes” on the basis that ‘Abd al-Ghani [b. Sa'īd] rendered his father’s name as “Kariz,” since it was actually “Kurayz,” as Dāraqutnī and others gave it.

*Hizām* is the form used among the tribe of Quraysh and *Harām* among the Anṣārites. God knows best.

6 Abū Ṭālib Ahmad b. Naṣr b. Ṭālib al-Baghdādī was a teacher of Dāraqutnī. He died in Baghdad in 323/935 at over seventy years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:68.

7 Ṭabarānī calls this obscure individual “Salāma b. Nāhiḍ al-Tiryāqī al-Maqdīsī” in *al-Muṣjam al-ṣaghīr* (ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt, Beirut, 1406/1986), 191.

8 Jubbā'ī (235/849–303/915) was one of the most celebrated Mu'tazilite theologians of the third/ninth century; *EP*, 2:569–70; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:621–2.

9 See Ibn Ishāq, *The Life of Muhammad*, 482–4.

10 Ibn Ishāq said that he was the chief of the Jewish tribe of the Banu 'l-Naḍīr during the time of the Prophet’s mission; *The Life of Muhammad*, 361.

11 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī'āb*, 1:70.

12 Al-Husayn b. Muḥammad (427/1035–498/1105), perhaps better known as Abū 'Ali al-Jayyānī, was an Andalusian expert in the Arabic language; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:148–51. His *Taqyid al-muhmal wa-tamyīz al-mushkil* set down the correct pronunciation of the problematic names in Bukhārī and Muslim; see Ḥāfiẓ Khalifa, *Kashf*, 1:col. 420, Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:141. The section of the work concerned with nicknames has recently been published as *Kitāb al-Alqāb*, ed. Muḥammad Abu 'l-Faḍl (al-Muḥammadīya, 1416/1996).

13 Muḥammad b. Waddāh (199/815–286/899) was a scholar from Cordova; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:474–5.

14 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):421; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):256.

15 The Caliph Umar sent 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Ghanm (d. 78/697) to Syria to teach religious law. Scholars disagreed as to whether he was a Companion or a Follower; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:45–6.

Abū ‘Alī b. al-Burdānī<sup>16</sup> stated that he heard the expert al-Khaṭīb saying, “The ‘Ayshīs are Baṣrāns, the ‘Absīs Kūfans and the ‘Ansīs Syrians.” Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim had said this before him.<sup>17</sup> This does hold true in most cases. God knows best.

Abū ‘Ubayda is always “‘Ubayda.” We read that Dāraqutnī said, “We do not know of anyone with the paidronymic ‘Abū ‘Abida.”

The following are some things the exact pronunciation of which I worked hard to determine in the course of my investigation of those mentioned by Dāraqutnī, ‘Abd al-Ghanī and Ibn Mākūlā.

*Al-Safr* and *al-Safar*: I found that as a paidronymic it is “al-Safar” and elsewhere “al-Safr.” Nevertheless, some North Africans pronounce it “al-Safr” for Abu ‘l-Safar Sa‘īd b. Yūḥmīd.<sup>18</sup> That is contrary to the opinion of the scholars of ḥadīth as recorded by Dāraqutnī.

*Qisl* and *‘Asal*: I found that all of them are of the first kind – including Qisl b. Sufyān<sup>19</sup> – except the secular historian ‘Asal b. Dhakwān al-Baṣrī.<sup>20</sup> He is “‘Asal” and Dāraqutnī and others give it that way. I did find his name as “Qisl” in the handwriting of the authority Abū Maṇṣūr al-Azharī<sup>21</sup> in his book *Tahdhīb al-lughā*. I do not think that he recorded it accurately. God knows best.

*Ghannām* and *‘Aththām*: we do not know of any instance of the second form except ‘Aththām b. ‘Alī al-‘Āmirī al-Kūfī, the father of ascetic ‘Alī b. ‘Aththām.<sup>22</sup> The rest belong to the first form, including Ghannām b. Aws,<sup>23</sup> a Companion who fought in the battle of Badr. God knows best.

*Qumayr* and *Qamīr*: all of them are “Qumayr” – including Makkī b. Qumayr,<sup>24</sup> who transmitted ḥadīth from Ja‘far b. Sulaymān<sup>25</sup> – except the wife of Maṣrūq b. al-Ajda‘, Qamīr bint ‘Amr.<sup>26</sup> God knows best.

16 Abū ‘Alī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Burdānī (or al-Baradānī, 426/1035–498/1105) was an expert in the field of ḥadīth who composed a book on dreams of the Prophet; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 19:219–21.

17 *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 221.

18 Abu ‘l-Safār died in 113/731; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:70.

19 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):93; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):42–3.

20 I have not found any information about this person.

21 Abū Maṇṣūr al-Azharī (282/895–370/980) wrote a number of lexicographical works; *EF*, 1:822.

22 ‘Alī b. ‘Aththām died in 228/843 in Tarsus; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:569–71.

23 This appears to be the Ghannām Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr identifies as “rajul min al-Ṣahāba madhkūr fi ahl Badr;” *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1255–6.

24 I have not located this transmitter in any of the sources I consulted.

25 This appears to be a reference to the prominent Shiīte transmitter of ḥadīth Abū Sulaymān Ja‘far b. Sulaymān al-Dubāṣī al-Baṣrī (d. 178/794); Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:197–200.

26 I have not succeeded in uncovering any information about this woman.

*Musawwar* and *Miswar*: “Musawwar” is the form of the name of the Companion Musawwar b. Yazīd al-Mālikī al-Kāhili<sup>27</sup> and Musawwar b. ‘Abd al-Malik al-Yarbū‘ī,<sup>28</sup> from whom Ma‘n b. Īsā<sup>29</sup> related ḥadīth. Bukhārī mentioned him. So far as we know, the rest are “Miswar.” God knows best.

*Al-Hammāl* (porter) and *al-Jammāl* (camel driver): we do not know among the transmitters of ḥadīth – or at least those mentioned in the books of ḥadīth in general circulation – of an instance of “al-Hammāl” as either an attribute or a name, except in the case of Hārūn b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Hammāl,<sup>30</sup> the father of the expert Mūsā b. Hārūn al-Hammāl.

The expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī related that Hārūn was a dealer in hawks (*bazzāz*) and, when he renounced the world, he became a porter. Khalīlī<sup>31</sup> and Ibn al-Falakī claimed that Hārūn was nicknamed “al-Hammāl” because of the great amount of knowledge he “carried.” I do not regard what they said as correct.

The others are “al-Jammāl,” including Muḥammad b. Mihrān al-Jammāl,<sup>32</sup> from whom Bukhārī, Muslim and others transmitted ḥadīth. God knows best.

Sometimes in this Category one encounters names in which it is impossible to make a mistake and one is correct no matter how one pronounces them, as is the case, for example, with Īsā b. Abī Īsā *al-Hannāt*.<sup>33</sup> He is also called “al-Khabbāt” and “al-Khayyāt;” however, he is famous as “Īsā al-Hannāt.” He was a tailor (*khayyāt*) and then abandoned that and became a dealer in wheat (*hannāt*). Later, he left that too and became a camel-fodder merchant (*khabbāt*), selling the mixture of leaves (*khabaṭ*) which camels eat. The same is true of Muslim al-Khabbāt<sup>34</sup> in whom the three attributes are also united. The authority Dāraqutnī related that these attributes came together in these two individuals. God knows best.

27 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Isti‘āb*, 3:1400.

28 I have not succeeded in identifying this Musawwar.

29 Ma‘n (d. 198/814) was one of the most prominent students of the *imām* Mālik; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:304–6.

30 Hārūn al-Hammāl (171/788 or 172–243/858) was regarded as a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:115–16.

31 *Irshād*, 2:599–600.

32 Abū Jafṣar Muḥammad b. Mihrān al-Jammāl al-Rāzī (d. 239/853) was considered one of the greatest ḥadīth transmitters of Khurāsān in his day; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:143.

33 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):404–5, no. 2793, s.n. Īsā b. Maysara al-Ghifārī; 405, no. 2794, s.n. Īsā b. Abī Īsā (see also note 3 on that page regarding Īsā b. Maysara b. Hayyān); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):290, no. 1606, s.n. Īsā b. Maysara al-Ghifārī.

34 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):260, no. 1097, s.n. Muslim al-Khayyāt al-Makki; 272, no. 1152, s.n. Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Khayyāt al-Makki; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):196, no. 857, s.n. Muslim b. Abī Muslim al-Khayyāt al-Makki.

## Subcategory 2

The accurate pronunciation of homographs in the two *Sahīhs* or in those two books and Mālik's *Muwaṭṭa'* in particular. For instance,

*Bashshār* the father of Bundār, Muḥammad b. Bashshār. The rest of those in the two books are "Yasār." Abū 'Alī al-Ghassānī said this in his book. *Sayyār* b. Salāma<sup>35</sup> and *Sayyār* b. Abī Sayyār Wardān<sup>36</sup> appear in both of the *Sahīhs*. However, "Sayyār" is not in this exact shape, although it is similar.<sup>37</sup> God knows best.

Everything in the two *Sahīhs* and the *Muwaṭṭa'* with the form of "Bishr" is pronounced "Bishr," with four exceptions and they are "Busr." They are the Companion 'Abd Allāh b. Busr al-Mazīnī, Busr b. Sa'īd,<sup>38</sup> Busr b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī and Busr b. Mihjan al-Dili.<sup>39</sup> For Ibn Mihjan, "Bishr" is also given. Aḥmad b. Ṣalīḥ al-Miṣrī related the pronunciation "Bishr" from a number of Ibn Mihjan's children and members of his tribe. Mālik and the majority of the experts gave the first version of the name [that is, "Busr"]. God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form of "Bashr" is "Bashr" with four exceptions. Two of them are "Bushayr" and they are Bushayr b. Ka'b al-Adawi<sup>40</sup> and Bushayr b. Yasār.<sup>41</sup> The third is Yusayr b. 'Amr,<sup>42</sup> who is also called "Usayr." The fourth is Qaṭān b. Nusayr.<sup>43</sup> God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form "Yazid" is "Yazid," with three exceptions:

1. Burayd b. 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Burda.<sup>44</sup>
2. Muḥammad b. 'Arāra b. al-Birind:<sup>45</sup> In *Kitāb 'Umdat al-muḥaddithin*<sup>46</sup> (*The Hadith Transmitters' Guide*) and elsewhere it is given as "Barand."

35 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):160; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):254.

36 Sayyār b. Wardān (d. 122/740) was famed for his piety; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:391–2.

37 That is, the consonantal outline of "Sayyār" differs slightly from that of "Bashshār" and "Yasār."

38 The ascetic Busr b. Sa'īd died in the year 100/719; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:594–5.

39 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 1(2):124; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(1):423–4.

40 Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:351, no. 131.

41 Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:591–2.

42 The Follower Yusayr died around the year 85/704. Shu'ba was the one who called him "Usayr"; Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 4(2):422; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):308.

43 Abū 'Abbād Qaṭān b. Nusayr al-Ghubārī al-Baṣrī was known as "al-Dhāri" (the wine skin); Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 3(2):138.

44 Burayd (d. ca. 140/757) was a controversial transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:251–2.

45 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 1(1):203; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(1):50–1.

46 The anthropomorphist Ḥanbalite Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ghanī b. 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Maqdīsī (541/1146–600/1203) was the author of this work; Ḥajjī Khalifa, *Kashf*, 2:col. 1171.

The first pronunciation is more common and Ibn Mākūlā mentioned nothing else.

3. ‘Alī b. Hāshim b. *al-Barid*.<sup>47</sup> God knows best.

Everything appearing in the books with the form of “*al-Barā’*” is “*Barā’*,” except *Abū Ma’shar al-Barrā’*<sup>48</sup> and *Abu ’l-Āliya al-Barrā’*.<sup>49</sup> A “*barrā’*” is someone who fashions (*yabri*) lutes. God knows best.

In the two *Sahīhs* and *Muwaṭṭa’*, there is no “*Jāriya*,” except *Jāriya b. Qudāma*<sup>50</sup> and *Yazīd b. Jāriya*.<sup>51</sup> The others are “*Hāritha*.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “*Hariz*,” except *Hariz b. Uthmān al-Rāhabī al-Himṣī*<sup>52</sup> and the judge *Abū Ḥariz ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Ḥusayn*,<sup>53</sup> the transmitter from *Ikrima* and others. The others are “*Jarir*.” Often they are confused with “*Hudayr*,” and in these books the *Hudayrs* are the father of *‘Imrān b. Hudayr*<sup>54</sup> and the father of *Zayd b. Hudayr*<sup>55</sup> and *Ziyād b. Hudayr*.<sup>56</sup> God knows best.

In these books there is no “*Hirāsh*,” except the father of *Ribā’i b. Hirāsh*.<sup>57</sup> The rest of those whose name takes this form are “*Khirāsh*.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “*Haṣin*,” except *Abū Haṣin Uthmān b. Āṣim al-Asadī*.<sup>58</sup> The rest are “*Husayn*.” All of these are “*Husayn*,” except *Abū Sāsān Hudayn b. al-Mundhir*. God knows best.

Everything in these books with the form of “*Hāzim*” and “*Abū Hāzim*” is pronounced “*Hāzim*,” except *Abū Mu’awiyah Muḥammad b. Khāzim al-Darīr*. God knows best.

47 The Shiīe transmitter ‘Alī b. Hāshim died around 180/796; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:342–5.

48 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):385; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):234–5.

49 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):365–6, s.n. Ziyād; id., *Kunā*, 89; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):365–6, s.n. Ziyād.

50 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):237; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):520.

51 Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):255, no. 1071; 2(1):558, no. 2526, s.n. Zayd b. Jāriya.

52 Although *Ḥariz* (80/699–163/780) was rated a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth, there was a suspicion that he hated the caliph ‘Alī; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:79–81.

53 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):72; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):34–5.

54 ‘Imrān b. Hudayr was a Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 149/766; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:363–4.

55 In the works I consulted, I could find no entry on Ziyād’s brother Zayd.

56 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):348–9; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):529.

57 It is said that the Follower *Ribā’i b. Hirāsh* never told a lie; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:359–62.

58 Abū Haṣin (d. ca. 128/746) was a highly regarded Kūfan transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:412–17.

Those who appear in these books as “*Habbān*” are Ḥabbān b. Munqidh<sup>59</sup> – who was the father of Wāsiṭ b. Ḥabbān,<sup>60</sup> the grandfather of Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. Ḥabbān<sup>61</sup> and the grandfather of Ḥabbān b. Wāsiṭ b. Ḥabbān<sup>62</sup> – and Ḥabbān b. Hilāl,<sup>63</sup> who is referred to with and without his lineage and who was a transmitter from Shu‘ba [b. al-Hajjāj], Wuhayb [b. Khālid], Hammām b. Yaḥyā,<sup>64</sup> Abān b. Yazīd, Sulaymān b. al-Mughīra<sup>65</sup> and Abū ‘Awāna.<sup>66</sup> Those in these books who are “*Hibbān*” are Hibbān b. ‘Aṭīya<sup>67</sup> and Hibbān b. Mūsā;<sup>68</sup> that is, the “*Hibbān*” who is referred to without a lineage as transmitting from ‘Abd Allāh – and “*Abd Allāh*” here is ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. The name of Ibn al-‘Ariqa<sup>69</sup> is also “*Hibbān*.” The rest are “*Hayyān*.” God knows best.

Those who appear in these books as “*Khubayb*” are Khubyab b. ‘Adī,<sup>70</sup> Khubyab b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Khubyab b. Yasāf<sup>71</sup> – and he is the “*Khubayb*” referred to without any lineage as a transmitter from Hafṣ b. ‘Āṣim<sup>72</sup> and from ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ma‘n<sup>73</sup> – and Abū Khubyab ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Zubayr. The rest are “*Habib*.” God knows best.

In these books there is no “*Hukaym*” except Ḥukaym b. ‘Abd Allāh<sup>74</sup> and Ruzayq b. Ḥukaym.<sup>75</sup> God knows best.

Everything in these books written as “*Rabāh*” is “*Rabāh*,” except Ziyād b. Riyāḥ<sup>76</sup> and he is Abū Qays, the transmitter from Abū Hurayra on the portents of the Day of Judgement and the dissolution of the unity of the Community. The

59 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī’āb*, 1:318.

60 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):190; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 4(2):48.

61 Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā died in 121/739; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:186–7.

62 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):112; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 2(2):296–7.

63 Abū Ḥabib Ḥabbān b. Hilāl al-Baḥīlī (ca. 130/748–216/831) was a respected Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:239–40.

64 Abū Bakr (or Abū ‘Abd Allāh) Hammām b. Yaḥyā b. Dīnār al-‘Awḍhī (d. 164/781) was a controversial Baṣrān transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:296–301.

65 Sulaymān b. al-Mughīra (d. 165/782) was also a prominent transmitter of ḥadīth in al-Baṣrā; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:415–19.

66 Abū ‘Awāna al-Waddāh b. ‘Abd Allāh (d. 176/792) also transmitted ḥadīth in al-Baṣrā; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:217–22.

67 I have not found an entry on this Ḥibbān in the sources I consulted.

68 Hibbān b. Mūsa b. Hibbān al-Dimashqī died in 231/846; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:11.

69 I have not found any information about Ibn al-‘Ariqa.

70 Khubyab b. ‘Adī was a Companion; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 1:246–9.

71 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):209; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):387.

72 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):359–60; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):184.

73 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):187; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 2(2):155.

74 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):94; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):286–7.

75 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):318–19; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):504.

76 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):351, s.n. Ziyād b. Rabāh; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārḥ*, 1(2):531.

majority of scholars pronounce it “Riyāḥ,” although Bukhārī did give it both ways, “Rabāḥ” and “Riyāḥ.” God knows best.

“Zubayd” and “Zuyayd” do not appear in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*, with the exception of Zubayd b. al-Hārith al-Yāmī.<sup>77</sup> In the *Muwaṭṭa'*, there is only Zuyayd and he is Zuyayd b. al-Ṣalt.<sup>78</sup> God knows best.

There is a single “*Salim*” in these books and he is Salim b. Hayyān.<sup>79</sup> The rest are “*Sulaym*.” God knows best.

In these books are *Salm* b. Zarīr,<sup>80</sup> *Salm* b. Qutayba,<sup>81</sup> *Salm* b. Abi 'l-Dhayyāl<sup>82</sup> and *Salm* b. 'Abd al-Rahmān.<sup>83</sup> The rest are “*Sālim*.” God knows best.

In these books are *Surayj* b. Yūnus,<sup>84</sup> *Surayj* b. al-Nu'mān<sup>85</sup> and Ahmād b. Abī Surayj.<sup>86</sup> The rest are “*Shurayh*” in these books. God knows best.

In these books are *Salmān* al-Fārisī, *Salmān* b. 'Āmir,<sup>87</sup> *Salmān* al-Agharr<sup>88</sup> and 'Abd al-Rahmān b. *Salmān*.<sup>89</sup> The rest are “*Sulaymān*.” Abū Hāzim al-Ashja'ī<sup>90</sup> – the transmitter from Abū Hurayra – and Abū Rājā<sup>91</sup> – the client of Abū Qilābā – both bore the name “*Salmān*,” but are referred to by their paidonymic. God knows best.

In these books “*Salima*” is 'Amr b. Salima al-Jarmī,<sup>92</sup> the prayer leader of his people. The Banū Salima were a tribe of the Anṣārites. The rest are “*Salama*.”

<sup>77</sup> Zubayd (d. 122/740) was famous for his asceticism; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:296–8.

<sup>78</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(1):447–8; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 1(2):622.

<sup>79</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):213; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):314.

<sup>80</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):158; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):264.

<sup>81</sup> The ḥadīth transmitter Abū Qutayba *Salm* b. Qutayba al-Khurāṣānī died in 200/816; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 9:308–9.

<sup>82</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):159; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):265–6.

<sup>83</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):156, no. 2310; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):263–4.

<sup>84</sup> Abu 'l-Hārith *Surayj* b. Yūnus al-Marwazī died in 235/849; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:146–7.

<sup>85</sup> Abu 'l-Husayn (or Abu 'l-Hasan) *Surayj* b. al-Nu'mān b. Marwān al-Baghdādī died in 217/833; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:219–20.

<sup>86</sup> Abū Ja'far Ahmad b. Abī Surayj Umar al-Rāzī died around the year 240/854 at over 80 years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:552.

<sup>87</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):136; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):297.

<sup>88</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):137; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):297.

<sup>89</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 3(1):294; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(2):241–2.

<sup>90</sup> Abū Hāzim al-Ashja'ī (d. ca. 100/719) was a prolific transmitter from Abū Hurayra; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:7–8.

<sup>91</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):139; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):299.

<sup>92</sup> The Companion Abū Burayd (or Abū Yazid) 'Amr b. Salima al-Jarmī settled in al-Baṣra where he died in 85/704; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:523–4.

However, “‘Abd al-Khāliq b. Salama”<sup>93</sup> in the book of Muslim is given there as both “Salima” and “Salama.” God knows best.

These books include *Sinān* b. Abī *Sinān* al-Dū’alī, *Sinān* b. Salama,<sup>94</sup> Abū Rabi‘a Sinan,<sup>95</sup> Ahmad b. *Sinān*, Umm *Sinān*<sup>96</sup> and Abū *Sinān* Dirār b. Murra al-Shaybāni.<sup>97</sup> The others are “*Shaybān*.” God knows best.

There is no “*Abida*” in these three books, except ‘Abida al-Salmānī, ‘Abida b. Humayd,<sup>98</sup> ‘Abida b. Sufyān<sup>99</sup> and ‘Āmir b. ‘Abida al-Bāhilī.<sup>100</sup> Everyone else is “*Ubayda*.” God knows best.

“*Ubayd*” is pronounced “*Ubayd*” wherever it occurs in these books.

Likewise, “*Ubāda*” is pronounced “*Ubāda*” wherever it occurs, except in the case of Muḥammad b. ‘Abāda al-Wāsiṭī,<sup>101</sup> one of the teachers of Bukhāri. God knows best.

“*Abda*” is pronounced “*Abda*” wherever it occurs in these books, except in the case of ‘Āmir b. ‘Abada<sup>102</sup> – who is mentioned in the introduction to Muslim’s book – and Bajāla b. ‘Abada.<sup>103</sup> However, there is disagreement regarding them. Some also give them as “*Abda*.” Some of the transmitters of Muslim’s book have “‘Āmir b. ‘Abd” and that is incorrect. God knows best.

In these books “*Abbād*” is pronounced “*Abbād*,” except in the case of Qays b. ‘Ubād. God knows best.

There is no “*Uqayl*” in these books, except ‘Uqayl b. Khālid,<sup>104</sup> Yahyā b. ‘Uqayl,<sup>105</sup> and Banū ‘Uqayl for the tribe. The rest are “*Aqil*.” God knows best.

93 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 3(2):125; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 3(1):36–7.

94 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):162; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 2(1):250.

95 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):164; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 2(1):251–2.

96 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1941.

97 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 2(2):339; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 2(1):465.

98 Abu ‘Abd al-Rahmān ‘Abida b. Humayd b. Shuhayb al-Kūftī (107/725–190/806) was a highly regarded transmitter of hadith; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:508–10.

99 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 3(2):82; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 3(1):91.

100 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 3(2):455; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 3(1):327.

101 Dhahabi, *al-Kāshif fi ma’rifat man lahu riwāya fi ’l-kutub al-sitta*, 3 vols (Cairo, 1392/1972), 3:57–8.

102 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 3(2):452, no. 2963; id., *Kunā*, 86; s.n. Abū Iyās al-Bajalī; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 3(1):327.

103 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 1(2):146, s.n. Bajāla b. ‘Abd; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 1(1):437, s.n. Bajāla b. ‘Abd.

104 The respected transmitter Abū Khālid ‘Uqayl b. Khālid al-Aylī died in al-Fusṭāṭ in Egypt around the year 144/761; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:301–3.

105 Bukhāri, *al-Ta’rikh al-kabir*, 4(2):292; Ibn Abī Ḥatim, *Jarh*, 4(2):176.

There is no “*Wāfid*” at all in these books. Every instance in them is “*Wāqid*.” God knows best.

### Gentilics

The expert al-Qādī Qyād said that these books do not contain an “*Ubullī*” and everything with this form is to be pronounced “*Aylī*.” In fact, Muslim related many ḥadīth from Shaybān b. Farrūkh<sup>106</sup> and he is “*Ubullī*.” However, as he nowhere in Muslim’s work appears with the gentilic, Qyād cannot be faulted. God knows best.

In the two *Şahihs* we do not know of an “*al-Bazzār*,” except Khalaf b. Hishām al-Bazzār<sup>107</sup> and al-Hasan b. al-Şabbāh al-Bazzār.<sup>108</sup> Muḥammad b. al-Şabbāh *al-Bazzāz*<sup>109</sup> and everyone else in the two books are “*al-Bazzāz*.” God knows best.

There are only three people with the gentilic “*Naṣrī*” in the two *Şahihs* and the *Muwaṭṭa'*. They are Mālik b. Aws b. al-Ḥadathān al-Naṣrī,<sup>110</sup> ‘Abd al-Wāhid b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Naṣrī<sup>111</sup> and Sālim, the client of the Naṣrīs. The rest of the names in those books with this form are “*Baṣrī*.” God knows best.

In these books there is only a single “*Tawwāzī*” and he is Abū Ya‘lā Muḥammad b. al-Şalt al-Tawwāzī,<sup>112</sup> who appears in the book of Bukhārī in the chapter on apostacy. Everyone else is “*Thawrī*,” including Abū Ya‘lā Mundhir b. Ya‘lā al-Thawrī,<sup>113</sup> whose ḥadīth both Bukhārī and Muslim included. God knows best.

Sa‘id *al-Jurayrī*,<sup>114</sup> ‘Abbās al-Jurayrī<sup>115</sup> and the Jurayrī who is not further named but who transmitted from Abū Nādra<sup>116</sup> are the only ones having this gentilic in

<sup>106</sup> Abū Muḥammad Shaybān b. Abī Shayba Farrūkh (140/757–236/851) was one of the most elevated transmitters of his day; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:101–2.

<sup>107</sup> Khalaf b. Hishām (150/767–229/844) was an expert in the Qurān; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:576–80.

<sup>108</sup> Bukhārī says that al-Hasan b. al-Şabbāh died in 249/863; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):295; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(2):19.

<sup>109</sup> Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. al-Şabbāh al-Dūlabī (151/768–227/841) is best known for the *Sunan* he composed; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:670–72.

<sup>110</sup> Mālik b. Aws was born before the advent of Islam and died in the year 92/711; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:171–2.

<sup>111</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(2):55; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):22.

<sup>112</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):118; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(2):289.

<sup>113</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):357; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):242.

<sup>114</sup> Ahmād b. Ḥanbal described Abū Mas‘id Sa‘id b. Iyās al-Jurayrī (d. 144/761) as “the ḥadīth transmitter of al-Baṣrā,” Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:153–6.

<sup>115</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abbās b. Farrūkh al-Jurayrī al-Baṣrī; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(1):4; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 3(1):211–12.

<sup>116</sup> Dhahabī claimed that Sa‘id al-Jurayrī transmitted ḥadīth from Abū Nādra al-Mundhir b. Mālik al-‘Abdī (d. 108/726 or 107); *Siyar*, 4:529–32.

these books. These works also contain a “*Harīrī*,” namely Yahyā b. Bishr,<sup>117</sup> the teacher of Bukhārī and Muslim. God knows best. They also contain a “*Jarīrī*,” namely Yahyā b. Ayyūb al-Jarīrī<sup>118</sup> in the book of Bukhārī, one of the descendants of Jarīr b. ‘Abd Allāh [al-Bajalī].

“*Jārī*” in these books is a single individual and he is the *Sādī*<sup>119</sup> whose gentilic refers to al-Jār, a seaport on the coast of Medina, by Judda [that is, modern-day Jidda]. God knows best. Everyone else is “*Hārīthī*.” God knows best.

“*Hizāmī*” is pronounced “*Hizāmī*” wherever it occurs. God knows best.

“*Salamī*,” when it is applied to an Anṣārīte, is “*Salamī*,” a gentilic referring to the Banū Salima. Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh and Abū Qatāda are representatives of them. The experts in the Arabic language pronounce the gentilic form “*Salamī*,” like “*Namari*,” “*Şadafī*” and similar ones. Most of the scholars of ḥadīth pronounce it “*Salimī*” – in accordance with the original name [that is, Salima] – and that is a solecism. God knows best.

“*Hamadhānī*” does not occur in the two *Ṣaḥīhs* and the *Muwaṭṭā*. Everything in them with this shape is “*Hamdānī*.” Abū Naṣr b. Mākūlā has said, “*Hamdānī*: Among the ancients ‘*Hamdānī*’ predominated and among the moderns ‘*Hamadhānī*’ is more common.” He is right. God knows best.

This is merely an outline. If a student were to travel to study this material, it would be a worthwhile journey, God – He is exalted – willing. It is the duty of the ḥadīthologist to commit these homographs to the inmost part of his being. Regarding some of them there is a threat of undoing some of the previously mentioned unique names. I relied on the book of al-Qādī Ġiyād<sup>120</sup> for some of them. I seek refuge in God for this and for all of my affairs. He – be He praised – knows best.

117 Abū Zakariyāyah b. Bishr al-Harīrī was a merchant who died in al-Kūfah in 229/844 (or 227); Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:647–8.

118 Yahyā b. Ayyūb al-Jarīrī died around the year 160/777; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:10.

119 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):66; Ibn Abī Hatim, *Jārh*, 2(1):96.

120 This would seem to be a reference to *Mashāriq al-anwār*.

## Category 54

### HOMONYMIC NAMES, GENTILICS, AND SO FORTH

(*Ma'rifat al-muttafiq wa-'l-muftariq min al-asmā'*  
*wa-'l-ansāb wa-naḥwihā*)

---

This Category concerns the names and gentilics which are pronounced and written the same. This is in contrast to the previous Category, in which the names and gentilics had the same written form but differed in pronunciation. In the study of theoretical law, this phenomenon comes under the rubric of what is called “shared” (*mushtarak*). More than one of the greats has erred because of it and “sharing” remains a breeding ground of mistakes in every discipline. Al-Khaṭīb has a book on it, *Kitāb al-Muttafiq wa-'l-muftariq* (*Homonyms*), which, despite its ample size, does not exhaustively treat the subcategories which I will mention, God – He is exalted – willing.

1. Different people who share the same name and whose fathers share the same name: an example of this is “al-Khalil b. Aḥmad.” There are six of them and al-Khaṭīb missed the last four.

The first of them was the Başran grammarian and inventor of prosody. He transmitted ḥadīth from Āṣim al-Āḥwal and others. Abū 'l-‘Abbās al-Mubarrad said, “If someone searched, he would not find anyone after our Prophet (Peace be upon him) whose name was ‘Aḥmad’ before the father of al-Khalil b. Aḥmad.” The historian Abū Bakr [b. Abī Khaythama] stated that he still heard the genealogists and secular historians saying that they do not know of anyone earlier. “Abu 'l-Safar Sa'īd b. Aḥmad” was cited against al-Mubarrad – on the basis of the statement of Yaḥyā b. Ma'īn regarding the name of his father – and he was earlier. Al-Mubarrad responded that most scholars say that he was “Sa'īd b. Yuhmid.” God knows best.

The second was Abū Bishr al-Muzāni,<sup>1</sup> also a Başran. He transmitted ḥadīth from al-Mustanir b. Akhḍar<sup>2</sup> from Mu'āwiya b. Qurra. Al-‘Abbās [b. 'Abd al-‘Azīz] al-‘Anbarī and a number of others related from him.

The third was an Isfahani<sup>3</sup> who related ḥadīth from Rawḥ b. 'Ubāda.<sup>4</sup>

---

1 Bukhārī, *al-Tārīkh al-kabīr*, 2(1):200; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārī*, 1(2):380, no. 1735.

2 Although both Bukhārī and Ibn Abī Ḥātim mentioned this individual in their entry on this al-Khalil b. Aḥmad, they do not seem to have provided an entry for him.

3 This would appear to be the Abū 'l-‘Abbās al-Khalil b. Mu'āmmad al-‘Ijlī who transmitted ḥadīth from Rawḥ b. 'Ubāda; Abū Nu'aym al-İsbahānī, *Kitāb Dhikr akhbār İsbahān*, 1:307–8.

4 Abū Mu'āmmad Rawḥ b. 'Ubāda al-Qaysī al-Baṣrī (d. 205/820) knew an enormous number of ḥadīth and wrote several works on religious subjects; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:39–40.

The fourth was Abū Sa‘id al-Sijzī,<sup>5</sup> the famous Ḥanafite judge and legal scholar in Khurāsān. He transmitted ḥadīth from [Abū Bakr] b. Khuzayma, Ibn Ṣā‘id,<sup>6</sup> [Abu ’l-Qāsim ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad] al-Baghawī and other expert transmitters of ḥadīth.

The fifth was the judge Abū Sa‘id al-Bustī al-Muhallabī.<sup>7</sup> He was an excellent man who related ḥadīth from the aforementioned al-Khalil al-Sijzī. He transmitted Ibn Abi Khaythama’s *Ta’rīkh* (*History*) from Aḥmad b. al-Muẓaffar al-Bakrī<sup>8</sup> as well as ḥadīth from other scholars. The expert Bayhaqī related ḥadīth from him.

The sixth was also an Abu ’l-Sa‘id al-Bustī but he was “al-Shāfi‘ī.”<sup>9</sup> He was an excellent man and active in several disciplines. He traveled to Andalusia and transmitted ḥadīth. He was born in 360 [971 AD]. He related from Abū Ḥāmid al-Isfārayīnī<sup>10</sup> and others. Abu ’l-‘Abbās al-‘Udhri<sup>11</sup> and others transmitted ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

2. Different people who share the same name, whose fathers share the same name and whose grandfathers or even earlier ancestors share the same name: one example of this is “Aḥmad b. Ja‘far b. Ḥamdān.” There were four of them, all living in the same era.<sup>12</sup>

One of them was Abū Bakr al-Qaṭī‘ī al-Baghdādī,<sup>13</sup> the transmitter from ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal.

The second was Abū Bakr al-Saqāṭī al-Baṣrī,<sup>14</sup> who also relates ḥadīth from an “‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad,” but in this case he is ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm al-Dawraqī.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>5</sup> This al-Khalil b. Aḥmad was born in 289/902 and died in Farghāna in 378/988. He served as judge in Samarcand and was one of the most prominent Ḥanafite figures of his day; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 16:437–9.

<sup>6</sup> Abū Muḥammad Yaḥyā b. Muḥammad b. Ṣā‘id al-Baghdādī (228/842–318/930) was one of the great ḥadīth experts in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:176.

<sup>7</sup> I could not find this al-Khalil b. Aḥmad in the sources I consulted.

<sup>8</sup> I have been unable to locate any information about this individual.

<sup>9</sup> I have found no information about this figure.

<sup>10</sup> Abū Ḥāmid Aḥmad b. Abī Ṭāhir Muḥammad al-Isfārayīnī (344/955–406/1016) was the head of the Shāfi‘ites in Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 17:193–7.

<sup>11</sup> Abu ’l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. ʿUmar b. Anas al-‘Udhri (393/1003–478/1085) was an Andalusian scholar who spent eight years in Mecca; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 18:567–8.

<sup>12</sup> Contemporaries sharing the same name were accorded special attention because they could not be distinguished by their relative place in isnāds.

<sup>13</sup> Aḥmad b. Mālik al-Qaṭī‘ī (d. 368/979) was best known for transmitting Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal’s *Musnād* from his son ‘Abd Allāh; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:200.

<sup>14</sup> I could not find this Aḥmad b. Mālik in the sources I consulted.

<sup>15</sup> The ḥadīth transmitter Ibn al-Dawraqī died in 276/889; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 13:153–4.

The third was a Dīnawārī<sup>16</sup> who related ḥadīth from ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Sinān<sup>17</sup> from Muḥammad b. Kathīr, the student of Sufyān al-Thawrī.

The fourth was a Tarsūsī<sup>18</sup> who related the *Ta’rīkh (History)* of Muḥammad b. ʻIsā [b.] al-Ṭabbā‘<sup>19</sup> from ‘Abd Allāh b. Jābir al-Tarsūsī.<sup>20</sup>

Another example of this is “Muḥammad b. Ya‘qūb b. Yūsuf al-Nisābūrī.” There were two of them, both in the same era. Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim and others relate ḥadīth from both of them. One of them was known as Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Asamm<sup>21</sup> and the other was Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Akhrām al-Shaybānī, and he – not the first – is known as “al-Hāfiẓ.” God knows best.

3. Instances of different people sharing both the same paidronymic and gentilic: an example of this is “Abū ʻImrān al-Jawnī.” There were two. One of them was the Follower ‘Abd al-Malik b. Ḥabib<sup>22</sup> and the name of the second was Mūsā b. Sahl,<sup>23</sup> a Baṣrān who lived in Baghdaḍ and related ḥadīth from Hishām b. ‘Amāmār and others. Da‘laj b. Aḥmad<sup>24</sup> and others transmitted from him.

“Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh” is a similar case. There were three of them.

The first is the Qurān reciter and transmitter of ḥadīth. The difference of opinion regarding his name (*ism*) has already been mentioned.<sup>25</sup>

The second is Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh al-Ḥimṣī, from whom Ja‘far b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Hāshimī<sup>26</sup> transmitted ḥadīth. He is “unknown” and Ja‘far was not reliable.

The third is Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh al-Sulāmī al-Bajaddā‘ī,<sup>27</sup> the author of *Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth (Rare Words in the Hadīth)*. His name is

<sup>16</sup> I have not located this person.

<sup>17</sup> I have not located ‘Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Sinān in any of the sources I consulted.

<sup>18</sup> I have no information on this individual.

<sup>19</sup> Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ʻIsā al-Ṭabbā‘ al-Baghdādī (d. 224/839), the brother of Isḥāq, is said to have known around forty thousand ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:386–9.

<sup>20</sup> I have not located any information on this person.

<sup>21</sup> As a boy, Abu ‘l-‘Abbās al-Asamm (247/861–346/957) traveled extensively with his father to study ḥadīth and eventually became one of the foremost experts of his era; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:186.

<sup>22</sup> The ḥadīth of this Abū ʻImrān al-Jawnī (d. 123/741 or 128) are found in most of the major collections; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:255–6.

<sup>23</sup> Mūsā b. Sahl died in 307/919 at an advanced age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 14:261.

<sup>24</sup> Abū Muḥammad Da‘laj b. Aḥmad al-Sijistānī (ca. 259/873–351/962) was a wealthy merchant who gained an impressive reputation in the field of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:188.

<sup>25</sup> See above, p. 253.

<sup>26</sup> Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):483–4.

<sup>27</sup> Abū Bakr al-Husayn b. ‘Ayyāsh al-Sulāmī al-Bajaddā‘ī (d. 204/820) was a poorly known transmitter of ḥadīth; Ibn Ḥajar, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, 12 vols (Hyderabad, 1325–7), 2:362–3.

Husayn b. ‘Ayyāsh and he died in 204 [820 AD] in Bājaddā [a village near Baghdad]. ‘Alī b. Jamil al-Raqqī<sup>28</sup> and others related ḥadīth from him. God knows best.

4. The reverse of the previous type: an example of this is “Ṣalīḥ b. Abī Ṣalīḥ.” There were four of them.

One<sup>29</sup> of them was the client of al-Taw’ama bint Umayya b. Khalaf.<sup>30</sup>

The second was the son of Abū Ṣalīḥ Dhakwān al-Sammān [al-Zayyāt], the transmitter from Abū Hurayra.

The third was Ṣalīḥ b. Abī Ṣalīḥ al-Sadūsī.<sup>31</sup> He related ḥadīth from ‘Alī and ‘Ā’isha and Khallād b. ‘Umar<sup>32</sup> transmitted from him.

The fourth was Ṣalīḥ b. Abī Ṣalīḥ,<sup>33</sup> the client of ‘Amr b. Hurayth.<sup>34</sup> He related ḥadīth from Abū Hurayra and [the Qur’ān reciter and transmitter of ḥadīth] Abū Bakr b. ‘Ayyāsh transmitted from him. God knows best.

5. Different people who share their name, the name of their father and their gentilic: an example of this is “Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī.” There were two in nearly the same generation. One of them was the famous Anṣārite, the judge Abū ‘Abd Allāh, from whom Bukhārī and many others related ḥadīth. The paidronymic of the second<sup>35</sup> was Abū Salama and he was weak in ḥadīth. God knows best.

6. Cases of “sharing” in regard to the name or the paidronymic alone, which are nevertheless equivocal because these individuals are not referred to by any other part of their name: an example of this is what we heard from the expert and judge Ibn Khallād: “When ‘Ārim [that is, Abu ‘l-Nu‘mān Muhammad b. al-Fadl al-Sadūsī] and Sulaymān b. Ḥarb<sup>36</sup> say, ‘Hammād transmitted to us,’ it is Ḥammād b. Zayd. When [Mūsā b. Ismā‘il] al-Tabūdhakī and al-Hajjāj

28 This is another name I was unable to identify.

29 The *ism* of his father was Nabhān; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):291–2; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):416–18.

30 She seems to have been known only for her relationship to Ṣalīḥ.

31 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):283, no. 2824; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):406.

32 I have not found this person in the works I consulted.

33 The *ism* of his father is given as Mihrān; Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 2(2):283, no. 2823; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(1):413, no. 1814.

34 The Companion Abū Sa‘id ‘Amr b. Hurayth died in al-Kūfa in 85; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭikāb*, 3:1172.

35 Ibn Ḥibbān, *Majrūḥin*, 2:266–7.

36 For about five years, Abū Ayyūb Sulaymān b. Ḥarb al-Wāshiḥī (140/757–224/839) served as a judge in Mecca; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:330–4.

b. Minhāl<sup>37</sup> say, ‘Hammād informed us,’ it is Hammād b. Salama. When ‘Affān says, ‘Hammād informed us,’ it can be either of them.”<sup>38</sup> Then I found the report from Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Dhuḥlī<sup>39</sup> in which ‘Affān [b. Muslim] said, “When I say to you, ‘Hammād informed us,’ and I do not give the name of his father, it is Ibn Salama.” With the exception of the remarks on Tabūdhakī, Muḥammad b. Yahyā said what Ibn Khallād said.

Similar to that is what we heard regarding Salama b. Sulaymān<sup>40</sup> to the effect that he transmitted ḥadīth one day and said, “‘Abd Allāh told us.” He was asked, “The son of whom?” He said, “God be praised! Will you not be satisfied until I say for every ḥadīth, ‘Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Ḥanẓalī, who lived in Sikkat Ṣughd, informed us?’” Then Salama said, “When ‘Abd Allāh’ is mentioned in Mecca, it is Ibn al-Zubayr. When ‘Abd Allāh’ is mentioned in Medina, it is Ibn ‘Umar. When ‘Abd Allāh’ is mentioned in al-Kūfa, it is Ibn Mas‘ūd. When ‘Abd Allāh’ is mentioned in al-Baṣra, it is Ibn ‘Abbās. When ‘Abd Allāh’ is mentioned in Khurāsān, it is Ibn al-Mubārak.” The expert Abū Yaqīl al-Khalili al-Qazwīni said, “When an Egyptian says, ‘from ‘Abd Allāh,’ without naming the man’s father, it is Ibn ‘Amr; that is, [‘Amr] b. al-‘Āṣ. When a Meccan says, ‘from ‘Abd Allāh,’ without naming the father, it is Ibn ‘Abbās.”

Another case is “Abu ’l-Ḥamza” from Ibn ‘Abbās, when the paidronymic is given without further specification. One expert said that Shu‘ba related from seven “Abū Ḥamzās” from Ibn ‘Abbās. All of them are “Abū Ḥamza” except one and he is Abū Ḵamra Naṣr b. ʿImrān al-Ḍubaṭī.<sup>41</sup> They can be distinguished when Shu‘ba says just, “from Abū Ḥamza [that is, Jamra] from Ibn ‘Abbās.” Then it is from Naṣr b. ʿImrān. When he relates from the other “Abū Ḥamzās,” he mentions their names and lineages.<sup>42</sup> God knows best.

7. Homonyms in regard to the gentilic alone: one example of this is “Āmulī.” It may be the gentilic referring to the city of Āmul in Ṭabarastān. Abū Sa‘d al-Sam‘ānī said, “Most of the scholars of Ṭabarastān are from Āmul.”<sup>43</sup> Or it may be the gentilic referring to Āmul by the river Jayhūn. The gentilic of ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥammād al-Āmulī<sup>44</sup> refers to this Āmul. Bukhārī related ḥadīth from him

37 Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥajjāj b. Minhāl al-Anmātī was a Baṣran ḥadīth transmitter who died in either 216/831 or 217; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:352–4.

38 *Muhaddith al-fāṣil*, 284.

39 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Dhuḥlī al-Nīsābūrī (ca. 170/787–258/872) was called “the leader of the ḥadīth scholars of Khurāsān;” Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:273–85.

40 Very little seems to have been known about Salama b. Sulaymān (d. ca. 200/816); Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:433.

41 Abū Jamra was a Baṣran ḥadīth transmitter who died around 127/745; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:243–4.

42 The consonantal skeletons of “Abū Ḥamza” and “Abū Jamra” are identical; thus, when the student encountered these paidronymics in a written text, he could not distinguish them. Of course, when Shu‘ba originally recited the ḥadīth, he pronounced them differently.

43 *Ansāb*, 1:67.

44 ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥammād died in either 273/886 or 269; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:611.

in his *Sahih*. The North Africans Abū ‘Alī al-Ghassānī and later al-Qādī Qyād are incorrect in saying that his paidronymic refers to Āmul in Ṭabarastān. God knows best.

Another instance of that is “Hanafī.” This may be the gentilic referring to the tribe of the Banū Hanifa. Or it may be the gentilic referring to the legal school of Abū Hanifa. The bearers of both of these gentilics are numerous and well known. Muḥammad b. Tāhir al-Maqdīsī [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarānī], many scholars of ḥadīth and others used to make a distinction between the two meanings of the gentilic, saying in reference to the legal school, “Hanfī.” I have only come across one grammarian, the authority Abū Bakr b. al-Anbārī,<sup>45</sup> who endorsed that. He did so in his book *al-Kāfi*. Muḥammad b. Tāhir [that is, Ibn al-Qaysarānī] has a book entitled *Kitāb al-Ansāb al-muttafiqā*<sup>46</sup> (*Homonymic Gentilics*) on this type of homonym.

Beyond these types there are others which we need not mention. Homonyms do not exist without something to clarify them. The intended individual is sometimes uncovered by the examination of his transmissions. Often he is distinguished in some of them. Sometimes his identity is uncovered by examination of the condition of his student and his teacher. Occasionally scholars venture an opinion in that regard on the basis of a shaky guess.

One day al-Qāsim al-Muṭarriz<sup>47</sup> transmitted a ḥadīth from Abū Hammām<sup>48</sup> – or someone else – from al-Walīd b. Muslim from Sufyān. The expert Abū Ṭālib b. Naṣr asked him, “Who is this ‘Sufyān’?” He said, “This is Sufyān al-Thawrī.” Abū Ṭālib said to him, “On the contrary, he is Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna.” Al-Muṭarriz asked him, “On what basis do you say that?” He said, “Because al-Walīd related only a few well-documented ḥadīth from Thawrī while he was ‘full’ of Ibn ‘Uyayna.” God knows best.

45 Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim al-Anbārī (271/885–327/939) was a renowned grammarian who lived in Baghdad; Sezgin, *GAS*, 8:151–4; 9:144–7.

46 *Kitāb al-Ansāb al-muttafiqā fi 'l-khaṭṭ al-mutamāthila fi 'l-naqt wa-'l-dabṭ*, ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt (Beirut, 1411/1991), 57.

47 Abū Bakr al-Qāsim b. Zakariyā<sup>q</sup> al-Baghdādī al-Muṭarriz (ca. 220/835–305/917) composed several works on ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:170.

48 The transmitter Abū Hammām al-Walīd b. Abī Badr Shujā‘ (d. 243/857) is said to have collected a hundred thousand ḥadīth from reliable transmitters; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:23–4.

## Category 55

### A CATEGORY COMPOSED OF THE TWO PREVIOUS CATEGORIES

(*Naw<sup>c</sup> yatarakkabu min al-naw<sup>c</sup>ayn alladhayni qablahu*)

This Category consists of the instances in which the homonymy mentioned in the Category which we just finished occurs in the names of two individuals or the paidonymics which they are known by and the homography discussed in the Category before that occurs in their lineages or gentilics; or it consists of the reverse, with their names being homographic while their gentilics or their lineages, either in terms of names or paidonymics, are homonymic. In this regard, words which are similar and resemble one another are counted as homographs, even if they differ in some of their letters when written. Al-Khaṭīb composed a book on this subject, which he entitled *Kitāb Talkhiṣ al-mutashābih fī 'l-rasm*<sup>1</sup> (*Summary of the Names which Resemble One Another in Written Form*), and it is one of his finest books. However, the title he gave his book does not indicate as clearly as ours what its subject is.

One of the examples of the first form:

*Mūsā b. 'Ali* and *Mūsā b. 'Ulayy*: there are a number of the first, including *Abū Ṭsā al-Khuttali*<sup>2</sup> from whom the Qur'ān reciter *Abū Bakr b. Miqṣam*,<sup>3</sup> *Abū 'Ali [b.] al-Šawwāf*<sup>4</sup> and others related ḥadīth. The second is *Mūsā b. 'Ulayy b. Rabāh al-Lakhmi al-Miṣri*,<sup>5</sup> whose father's name is known to be "Ulayy." On the other hand, we heard that he forbade people to call him "Ulayy." It is said that the Egyptians used to pronounce it "Ali" for that reason and the Iraqis used to pronounce it "Ulayy." One expert used to say that "Ali" was his name and "Ulayy" (little 'Ali) was his nickname. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the name or paidronymic with homography in the gentilic:

*Muhammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Mukharrimi*<sup>6</sup> was a famous transmitter of ḥadīth. His gentilic refers to the Mukharrim section of Baghdad.

1 Ed. Sukayna al-Shihābī, 2 vols (Damascus, 1985).

2 Not much seems to have been known about this transmitter. See Sam'ānī, *Ansāb*, 2:322.

3 *Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ya'qūb al-Baghdādī al-'Aṭṭār* (265/879–354/965), known as Ibn Miqṣam, wrote a number of books on the Qur'ān; Brockelmann, *GAL, Suppl.*, 1:183

4 *Abū 'Ali Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Baghdādī* (270/884–359/970), known as Ibn al-Šawwāf, was a highly praised transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:184–6.

5 *Mūsā b. 'Ulayy b. Rabāh* (ca. 90/709–163/780) ruled Egypt for the 'Abbāsid caliph Manṣūr; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:411–12.

6 Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī described Mukharrimī (ca. 170/787–254/868) as "one of the most knowledgeable people in reports and most learned in ḥadīth"; *Ta'rīkh Baghdaḍ*, 5:423.

*Muhammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Makhramī*<sup>7</sup> was not famous. He related ḥadīth from the *imām* Shāfi‘ī. God knows best.

A case in which the names are similar and resemble each other despite some difference in their shape:

*Thawr b. Yazid al-Kalā‘ī al-Shāmī*<sup>8</sup> and *Thawr b. Zayd al-Dilī al-Madānī*<sup>9</sup> the second is the one from whom Mālik related and his ḥadīth are present in both of the *Sahīhs*. The ḥadīth of the first are found only in Muslim. God knows best.

An example of homonymy in the paidronymic and homography in the gentilic:

*Abū ‘Amr al-Shaybānī* and *Abū ‘Amr al-Saybānī* were two Followers who differ in that the first is “Shaybānī” and the second is “Saybānī.” The name of the first is “Sa‘d b. Iyās” and the lexicographer *Abū ‘Amr al-Shaybānī*, that is, Ishāq b. Mirār,<sup>10</sup> shares his paidronymic and gentilic. The name of the second is “Zur‘ā” and he is the father of Yahyā b. Abī ‘Amr al-Saybānī al-Shāmī.<sup>11</sup> God knows best.

Various examples of the second subcategory – which is the reverse of the first:

*‘Amr b. Zarāra* and *‘Umar b. Zarāra*: there are a number of the first, including *Abū Muhammad al-Nisābūrī*,<sup>12</sup> from whom Muslim related ḥadīth. The second is known as “al-Ḥadāthī”<sup>13</sup> and he is the one from whom [Abu ‘l-Qāsim] al-Baghawī al-Manī‘ transmits ḥadīth. We read in Dāraqutnī that he was from a city on the Byzantine frontier called “al-Ḥadāth.” We heard from the expert *Abū Ahmad al-Ḥākim* [al-Kabir] that he was one of the inhabitants of the town of al-Ḥadāthī [in northern Iraq] and his gentilic refers to it. God knows best.

*‘Ubayd Allāh b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh* and *‘Abd Allāh b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh*: the first is the son<sup>14</sup> of *Abū ‘Abd Allāh* Salmān al-Agharr, the student of *Abū Hurayra* from whom Mālik related ḥadīth. There are a number of the second, including the Qur‘ān reciter *‘Abd Allāh b. Abī ‘Abd Allāh*

7 I have not found any information about this scholar. The gentilic “Makhramī” was applied to the descendants of al-Miswar b. Makhrama b. Nawfal al-Qurashi; Ibn al-Athīr, *Lubāb*, 3:178.

8 Contemporaries suspected that the otherwise excellent transmitter Thawr (d. 153/770 or 155) was a Qadarite; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:344–5.

9 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(2):181; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):468.

10 Ishāq b. Mirār (or Marār) died in 210/825; al-Khattab al-Baghdādī, *Ta‘rīkh Baghdād*, 6:329–32.

11 Bukhārt, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):293; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(2):177.

12 ‘Amr b. Zarāra died in the year 238/852; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:406–7.

13 Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar b. Zarāra al-Ḥadāthī taught ḥadīth in Baghdad in the first half of the third/ninth century; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:407–8.

14 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 3(1):384; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 2(2):316.

al-İşbahānī from whom Abu 'l-Shaykh al-İşbahānī transmitted ḥadīth. God knows best.

*Hayyān al-Asādī* and *Ḩanān al-Asādī*. An example of the first is Ḥayyān b. Huṣayn,<sup>15</sup> the Follower who related ḥadīth from 'Ammār b. Yāsir. The second is Ḥanān al-Asādī,<sup>16</sup> a member of the tribe of the Banū Asad b. Shurayk. He is the uncle of Musarhad, the father of Musaddad. Dāraqutnī said this. He transmits ḥadīth from Abū 'Uthmān al-Nahdī. God knows best.

---

15 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*, 2(1):53–4; Ibn Abī Hātim, *Jarh*, 1(2):243.

16 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*, 2(1):112; Ibn Abī Hātim, *Jarh*, 1(2):299.

## Category 56

### TRANSMITTERS RESEMBLING ONE ANOTHER IN NAME AND LINEAGE WHO ARE DISTINGUISHED BY THE RELATIVE POSITION OF THE NAMES OF THE SON AND FATHER

(*Ma'rifat al-ruwāt al-mutashābihīn fi 'l-ism wa-'l-nasab  
al-mutamāyizīn bi-'l-taqdīm wa-'l-ta'khir fi 'l-ibn wa-'l-ab*)

---

An example of this is *Yazid b. al-Aswad* and *al-Aswad b. Yazid*. The first is the Companion *Yazid b. al-Aswad al-Khuzā'i*<sup>1</sup> and *Yazid b. al-Aswad al-Jurashi*,<sup>2</sup> who was born in pre-Islamic times, converted to Islam, lived in Syria and enjoyed a reputation for piety so great that [the Umayyad caliph] Mu'awiya asked him to pray for rain for the sake of the people of Damascus. Mu'awiya said, "God, today we beseech you for intercession through the best and most excellent of us [that is, *Yazid b. al-Aswad*]." It started raining immediately, almost before they could get back to their homes. The second was the excellent Follower *al-Aswad b. Yazid al-Nakha'i*.<sup>3</sup>

*Al-Walid b. Muslim* and *Muslim b. al-Walid* are also an example of this. The first is the Follower *al-Walid b. Muslim al-Baṣrī*,<sup>4</sup> the transmitter from Jundub b. 'Abd Allāh al-Bajali,<sup>5</sup> and the renowned *al-Walid b. Muslim al-Dimashqī*, the student of Awzā'i, from whom Ahmād b. Ḥanbal and many other people related ḥadīth. The second is *Muslim b. al-Walid b. Rabāḥ al-Madāni*,<sup>6</sup> who transmitted ḥadīth from his father and others. 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Darāwirdī and others related from him. Bukhārī mentioned him in his *Ta'rikh* (*History*) and reversed his name and lineage, saying "*al-Walid b. Muslim*,"<sup>7</sup> and he was reproached for that.

Al-Khaṭīb composed a book on this Category which he called *Kitāb Rāfi'* *al-irtiyāb fi 'l-maqlūb min al-asmā' wa-'l-ansāb* (*The Dispeller of Doubt in Cases of Reversed Names and Lineages*). Several times this title has given people the mistaken impression that its contents exclusively concern errors like the one mentioned in the second example [that is, Bukhārī's mistake].<sup>8</sup> That was not stipulated for the book and most of its contents do not concern that. Therefore the title we have given to this Category is more appropriate. God knows best.

1 Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Isti'āb*, 4:1571.

2 The Follower Jurashi lived in the countryside near Damascus; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:136–7.

3 Al-Aswad b. Yazid al-Nakha'i (d. ca. 75/694) was the uncle of the famous Kūfan jurist Ibrāhim al-Nakha'i; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:50–3.

4 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 4(2):152, no. 2530; Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):16, no. 68.

5 The Companion Jundab (d. ca. 70/689) is said to have lived in al-Kūfa and al-Baṣra; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 3:174–5.

6 Ibn Abi Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(1):197–8.

7 *Al-Ta'rikh al-kabir*, 4(2):153–4.

8 That is, the word *maqlūb* in al-Khaṭīb's title implies that the elements of the names were erroneously reversed.

## Category 57

### THOSE WHOSE LINEAGE REFERS TO SOMEONE OTHER THAN THEIR FATHER

(*Ma‘rifat al-mansūbin ilā ghayr ābā’ihim*)

There are several varieties of this.

#### 1. Those whose lineage refers to their mother. These include

Mu‘ādh b. ‘Afrā,<sup>1</sup> Mu‘awwidh b. ‘Afrā<sup>2</sup> and ‘Awdh b. ‘Afrā: she was their mother and their father was al-Ḥārith b. Rīfā‘a al-Anṣārī. Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said that the name of ‘Awdh was actually “Awf” and that that form is found more often in ḥadīth transmissions.<sup>3</sup> God knows best.

The muezzin Bilāl b. Ḥamāma: Ḥamāma was his mother and his father was Rabāḥ.

Suhayl b. Baydā‘<sup>4</sup> (literally, a fair-complexioned woman) and his two brothers Sahl<sup>5</sup> and Ṣafwān:<sup>6</sup> she was their mother and her name (*ism*) was “Da‘d.” Their father’s name was “Wahb.”

Shurahbil b. Ḥasana: she was his mother and his father was ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Muṭā‘ al-Kindī.

‘Abd Allāh b. Buhayna: she was his mother and his father was Mālik b. al-Qishb al-Azdi al-Asdī.

Sa‘d b. Ḥabta al-Anṣārī:<sup>7</sup> she was his mother and his father was Baḥr b. Mu‘āwiya. Sa‘d was an ancestor of the judge Abū Yūsuf [Ya‘qūb b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī].

The preceding were Companions (God be pleased with all of them). Other examples are

• Muḥammad b. al-Hanafīya (literally, the woman belonging to the tribe of the Banū Ḥanīfa): she was his mother and her name was “Khawla.” His father was ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib (God be pleased with him).

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1408–10.

2 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1442.

3 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1225–6.

4 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:667–8.

5 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:659–61.

6 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:723.

7 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:584–5.

Ismā‘il b. ‘Ulayya: she was his mother and his father was Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm.

Ibrāhīm b. Hirāsa:<sup>8</sup> ‘Abd al-Ghanī’ b. Sa‘id said, “She was his mother and his father was Salama.” God knows best.

## 2. Those whose lineage refers to their grandmother.

The Companion Ya‘qā b. Munya: according to al-Zubayr b. Bakkār,<sup>9</sup> she was his paternal grandmother and his father was Umayya.

Another is the Companion Bashir b. al-Khaṣāṣiya.<sup>10</sup> He was Bashir b. Ma‘bad and al-Khaṣāṣiya was the mother of his great-great-grandfather.

A more recent example of that was our teacher Abū Aḥmad ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Alī al-Baghdādī, who was known as “Ibn Sukayna.” She was his grandmother on his father’s side. God knows best.

## 3. Those whose lineage refers to their grandfather.

Abū ‘Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ,<sup>11</sup> one of the Ten [given the glad tidings of their acceptance into heaven]: Abū ‘Ubayda was ‘Āmir b. ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Jarrāḥ.

The Companion Ḥamal b. al-Nābigha al-Hudhalī:<sup>12</sup> he was Ḥamal b. Mālik b. al-Nābigha.

The Companion Mujammi‘ b. Jāriya:<sup>13</sup> he was Mujammi‘ b. Yazīd b. Jāriya.

Ibn Jurayj: he was ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Abd al-Azīz b. Jurayj.

The “sons” of al-Mājishūn, including Yūsuf b. Ya‘qūb b. Abī Salama al-Mājishūn:<sup>14</sup> Abū ‘Alī al-Ghassānī said, “‘Al-Mājishūn’ was the

<sup>8</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Tārīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):333; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):143. The vocalization “Harāsa” has also been suggested for the name of Ibrāhīm’s mother; Muḥammad Tāhir al-Fattānī, *al-Mughnī fi ḍabīt asmā’ al-rijāl* (Beirut, 1402/1982), 269.

<sup>9</sup> The judge Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Zubayr b. Bakkār al-Asadī (172/788–256/870) was an expert in genealogy; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:317–18.

<sup>10</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:173–4. “Al-Khaṣāṣiya” is also vocalized as “al-Khaṣāṣiya”; Muḥammad Tāhir al-Fattānī, *Mughnī*, 92.

<sup>11</sup> Abū ‘Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ was one of the most prominent of the early converts to Islam. He died in the year 18 at fifty-eight years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 1:5–23.

<sup>12</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 1:376.

<sup>13</sup> According to Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Mujammi‘ b. Jāriya and Mujammi‘ b. Yazīd b. Jāriya were two different people; *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1362–3.

<sup>14</sup> Yūsuf b. Ya‘qūb was a Medinese scholar of ḥadīth who died in 185/801 at the age of eighty-eight; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:371–3.

nickname of Ya‘qūb b. Abī Salama<sup>15</sup> and it was also applied to his sons and the sons of his brother ‘Abd Allāh b. Abī Salama.<sup>16</sup> The preferred interpretation is that “mājishūn” means “rosy-cheeked” [either in the dialect of the people of Medina or in Persian<sup>17</sup>].

Ibn *Abī Dhīb*: he was Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Mughira b. Abī Dhīb.

The jurist Ibn *Abī Laylā*:<sup>18</sup> he was Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā.

Ibn *Abī Mulayka*:<sup>19</sup> he was ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ubayd’Allāh b. Abī Mulayka.

The *imām* Aḥmad b. *Hanbal*: he was Abū ‘Abd Allāh Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. *Hanbal*.

The “sons” of *Abū Shayba*; that is, the ḥadīth experts Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān<sup>20</sup> and their brother al-Qāsim:<sup>21</sup> Abū Shayba was their grandfather. His name was “Ibrāhīm b. ‘Uthmān” and he was an inhabitant of Wāsiṭ. Their father was Muḥammad b. Abī Shayba.

A later example was Abū Sa‘id b. Yūnus, the author of *Ta’rīkh Miṣr* (*The History of Egypt*). He was ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Aḥmad b. Yūnus b. ‘Abd al-Āqā al-Ṣadafī. God knows best.

#### 4. Those whose lineage refers to a man other than their father on the basis of a non-blood tie. These include

Al-Miqdād b. *al-Aswad*: he was al-Miqdād b. ‘Amr b. Tha‘labā al-Kindī – and it is said, “al-Bahrānī.” He was one of the kin of al-Aswad b. ‘Abd Yaghūth al-Zuhri, who adopted him. Al-Miqdād’s lineage refers to him.

Al-Ḥasan b. *Dinār*: he is actually Ibn Wāṣil and Dīnār was the husband of his mother. It seems that this was unknown to Ibn Abī Ḥātim when he called him “al-Ḥasan b. Dīnār b. Wāṣil,” making Wāṣil his grandfather.<sup>22</sup> God knows best.

15 Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb b. Abī Salama Dīnār (or Maymūn) died around 120/738; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:370.

16 Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 3(1):100; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 2(2):70.

17 Sam‘ānī, *Ansāb*, 5:157.

18 This, the most famous, Ibn Abī Laylā (74/693–148/765), the son of the ḥadīth transmitter ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abī Laylā, is best known for his contributions to the field of law; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:518.

19 The ḥadīth transmitter Ibn Abī Mulayka died in 117/793 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:88–90.

20 Abū Bakr’s brother ‘Uthmān (d. 239/853) was a highly respected transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:151–4.

21 I was unable to locate any information about this brother.

22 *Jarh*, 1(2):11–12.

## Category 58

### GENTILICS THE ACTUAL SIGNIFICANCE OF WHICH DIFFERS FROM THE APPARENT ONE WHICH FIRST COMES TO MIND

(*Ma‘rifat al-nisab allati bātinuhā ‘alā khilāf zāhirihā  
alladhi huwa al-sābiq ila ‘l-fahm minhā*)

---

For example:

Abū Mas‘ūd Uqbā b. ‘Amr *al-Badrī*:<sup>1</sup> the majority of experts hold that he did not fight at the battle of Badr. Instead, he settled in the vicinity of the well of Badr and was given the gentilic on that basis.

Sulaymān b. Tirkhān *al-Taymī*: he lived with the tribe of Taym, but he was not one of them. He was a client of the Banū Murra.

Abū Khālid Yazid b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān *al-Dālānī*:<sup>2</sup> he was an Asādī; that is, a client of the Banū Asād. He lived with the Banū Dālān, a subtribe of the Hamdān, and was given the gentilic in reference to them.

Ibrāhīm b. Yazid *al-Khūzī*:<sup>3</sup> he was not from the region of al-Khūz. Rather, he lived on the pass of al-Khūz in Mecca.

‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān *al-‘Arzamī*:<sup>4</sup> he lived in the cemetery of the ‘Arzam in al-Kūfa. The ‘Arzam were a tribe considered part of the Fazāra and it is said that the gentilic is pronounced “‘Arzamī” rather than “‘Azramī.”

Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Sinān *al-‘Awaqī al-Baṣrī*:<sup>5</sup> he was a Bāhili who lived among the al-‘Awaqa, and they are a subtribe of the ‘Abd al-Qays. He was given his gentilic in reference to them.

Aḥmad [that is, Ḥamdān] b. Yūsuf *al-Sulamī*: he was a noble individual from whom Muslim and others related ḥadīth. He was actually an Azdī. He was known as “al-Sulamī” because, as he himself said, his mother was named “Sulayma” [that is, he had no connection to the Banū Sulaym].

---

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1074–5.

2 Abū Khālid was considered to be a very unreliable transmitter of ḥadīth; Sam‘ānī, *Ansāb*, 2:450.

3 Bukhārī, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, 1(1):336; Ibn Abī Hātim, *Jārh*, 1(1):146–7.

4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh (or Abū Muḥammad or Abū Sulaymān) ‘Abd al-Malik b. Abī Sulaymān Maysara al-‘Arzamī was a transmitter of ḥadīth who died in 145/762; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 6:107–9.

5 ‘Awaqī died in 223/838 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 10:385–6.

Abū ‘Amr [Ismā‘il] b. Nujayd *al-Sulamī*: he was known as “al-Sulamī” for the same reason. He was the grandson of Aḥmad b. Yūsuf al-Sulamī.

Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān *al-Sulamī*, the writer of books for Sufis: his mother was the daughter of the aforementioned Abū ‘Amr so he was given the gentilic “Sulamī.” He was also an Azdi. His grandfather was the paternal cousin of Aḥmad b. Yūsuf.

Similar to that phenomenon and connected with it are

Miqsam, *mawlā Ibn ‘Abbās*:<sup>6</sup> he was actually the client (*mawlā*) of ‘Abd Allāh b. al-Hārith b. Nawfal.<sup>7</sup> He was inseparable from [‘Abd Allāh] b. ‘Abbās and was called “*mawlā Ibn ‘Abbās*” because of this association with him.

Yazid *al-Faqir* (the poor):<sup>8</sup> he was one of the Followers and he was called that because he had been wounded in the spine (*faqār zahrī*). It hurt him so badly that he walked with a stoop.

Khālid *al-Hadhdhā*<sup>9</sup> (the cobbler): he was not a cobbler and he was called that because he sat among the shoemakers. God knows best.

6 Bukhart, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabīr*, 4(2):33, s.n. Miqsam b. Bujra; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jārh*, 4(1):414.

7 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣrāb*, 3:885–6.

8 Abū ‘Uthmān Yazid b. Ṣuhayb al-Kūftī is best known for having been a teacher of the *imām* Abū Ḥanīfa; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:227–8.

9 Abu ‘l-Munāzil Khālid b. Mihrān was a Baṣrī transmitter of ḥadīth who died around 141/758; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:190–3.

Category 59

OBSCURE REFERENCES

(Ma'rifat al-mubhamāt)

---

This is the discipline concerning the names of those men and women who are referred to obscurely in ḥadīth. The expert ‘Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa‘id, al-Khaṭīb [al-Baghdādī] and others wrote books on this subject. The identity of the obscure individual becomes known through the appearance of his name in other versions of the ḥadīth. However, the names of many of these individuals were never discovered.

This phenomenon take several forms. One of them – and it is one of the most obscure – is where the individual is referred to merely as “a man” or “a woman.”

One example of this is the ḥadīth of Ibn ‘Abbās (God be pleased with them [that is, Ibn ‘Abbās and his father]) to the effect that “a man” (*rajul*) said, “Messenger of God, does the pilgrimage take place every year?” This man was al-Aqra‘ b. Hābis.<sup>1</sup> Ibn ‘Abbās identified him in another version of the ḥadīth.

Another example is the ḥadīth of Abū Sa‘id al-Khudrī regarding some of the Companions of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) who passed by a tribe and the members of the tribe did not treat them as guests, so their leader was stung [by a scorpion]. “One of them” (*rajul minhum*) recited the first *sūra* of the Qur’ān in exchange for thirty sheep, and so forth. The one who made the incantation was the transmitter Abū Sa‘id al-Khudrī.

Another example is the ḥadīth of Anas to the effect that the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) saw a rope tied between two of the pillars in the mosque [of Medina] and asked about it. They replied, “A certain woman” (*fulāna*) prays here. When she is overcome, she holds on to the rope.” This woman is variously identified as Zaynab bint Jahsh,<sup>2</sup> the wife of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him); her sister Hamna bint Jahsh;<sup>3</sup> and Maymūna bint al-Hārith,<sup>4</sup> the mother of the believers [that is, the wife of the Prophet].

Another example is “the woman” (*al-mar'a*) who asked the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) about the major ablution for menstruation and

---

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istiṣāb*, 1:103.

2 The Prophet married Zaynab in the year 4/625; *EF*, 4:1199–200.

3 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Istiṣāb*, 4:1813.

4 Maymūna (d. 61/681) was the last wife the Prophet married; *EF*, 6:918.

he said, “Take a bit of musk.” She was the Anṣārīte Asmā’ bint Yazid b. al-Sakan.<sup>5</sup> She used to be called the “Preacher of the Women.” In a version of the ḥadīth given by Muslim she is identified as “Asmā’ bint Shakal.” God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon consists of those who are obscure because they are called “the son of X,” “the son of the Xite,” “the daughter of X” and the like.

An example of this is the ḥadīth of Umm ‘Aṭīya,<sup>6</sup> “‘One of the daughters of the Messenger of God’ (*iḥdā banāt Rasūl Allāh*) (Peace be upon him) died and he said, ‘Wash her with water and lotū tree leaves,’ and so forth.” She was Zaynab,<sup>7</sup> the wife of Abu ’l-Āṣi b. al-Rabi‘.<sup>8</sup> She was the Prophet’s eldest daughter (Peace be upon him and his family). It is also said that the eldest of his daughters was Ruqayya.<sup>9</sup> God knows best.

“Ibn al-Lutbiya” (the son of the Lutbite woman): Muḥammad b. Sa‘d<sup>10</sup> – the author of [*Kitāb*] *al-Tabaqāt [al-kabir]*<sup>11</sup> (*The Great Book of Generations*) – stated that his name is “‘Abd Allāh” and that the gentilic “al-Lutbiya” refers to the Banū Lutb, a subtribe of the Asd – and the Asd are the same as the Azd. He is also called “Ibn al-Utbiya,” and that is wrong.

“Ibn Mirba‘ al-Anṣārī,”<sup>12</sup> whom the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) dispatched to the people at ‘Arafa and said, “Keep to your shrines;” his name was “Zayd.” Wāqidi<sup>13</sup> and his amanuensis Ibn Sa‘d said, “His name was ‘‘Abd Allāh.’”<sup>14</sup>

5 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1787–8.

6 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1919, s.n. Nusayba bint al-Harith; 4:1947–8.

7 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1853–4.

8 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1701–4.

9 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1839–43.

10 Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Sa‘d (ca. 168/784–230/845) was born in al-Baṣra and settled in Baghdad where he served as the secretary of the famous biographer of the Prophet Wāqidi; *EP*, 3:922–3; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:300–1.

11 Although Ibn al-Lutbiya’s connection to the Azd is mentioned in Ibn Sa‘d’s work (*al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā*, ed. Ihsān ‘Abbas, 9 vols, Beirut, 1380/1960–1388/1968, 2:160), I have not located the passage where he identifies his *ism*.

12 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:558, s.n. Zayd b. Mirba‘ al-Anṣārī.

13 Although Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-Wāqidi (130/747–207/823) was not universally considered a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth, he was much esteemed for his expertise in the fields of Prophetic biography and History; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:294–7.

14 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr regarded ‘Abd Allāh as a brother of Zayd; *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:986.

The blind muezzin “Ibn Umm Maktūm;” his name is given variously as “‘Abd Allāh b. Zā’ida,” “Amr b. Qays,” and so forth. The name of Umm Maktūm was “Ātika bint ‘Abd Allāh.”

“The girl” (*al-ibna*) whom the tribe of the Banū Hishām b. al-Mughira wanted to wed to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalib (God be pleased with him) was al-‘Awra bint Abī Jahl b. Hishām. God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns uncles, aunts and the like. Examples are

Rāfi‘ b. Khadīj from “his paternal uncle” (*‘ammīhi*) in the ḥadīth regarding the contract to cultivate a field in exchange for a portion of its yield (*mukhābara*): His paternal uncle was Zuhayr b. Rāfi‘ al-Hārithī al-Anṣārī.<sup>15</sup>

Ziyād b. Ḥlāqā<sup>16</sup> from “his paternal uncle;” the uncle was Qutba b. Mālik al-Thaqabī.<sup>17</sup>

“The paternal aunt” (*‘amma*) of Jābir b. ‘Abd Allāh who began to weep for his father on the Day of the Battle of Uhud. Her name was “Fāṭima bint ‘Amr b. Ḥarām.” Wāqidi called her “Hind.” God knows best.

Another form of this phenomenon concerns husbands and wives. [Examples are]

The ḥadīth of Subay‘a al-Aslāmīya<sup>18</sup> to the effect that she gave birth a few days after the death of “her husband” (*zawjhā*): He was Sa‘d b. Khawla,<sup>19</sup> whom the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) described during his eulogy as dying in Mecca. He fought at the Battle of Badr.

[“The husband” of] Barwa<sup>c</sup> bint Wāshiq<sup>20</sup> the lexicographers pronounce her name as “Barwa<sup>c</sup>” while the scholars of ḥadīth generally pronounce it “Birwa<sup>c</sup>.” The name of her husband was “Hilāl b. Murra al-Ashja‘ī” according to what we have heard from more than one source.

“The wife” (*zawja*) of ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Zabīr,<sup>21</sup> who had been the wife of Rifā‘a b. Samawāl al-Qurāzī<sup>22</sup> before he divorced her; her name was “Tāmīma bint Wahb” and it is also given as “Tumayma” and “Suhayma.” God knows best.

<sup>15</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:778.

<sup>16</sup> Ziyād died around the year 125/743 at over one hundred years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:215–16.

<sup>17</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 3:1383.

<sup>18</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1859.

<sup>19</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:586–8.

<sup>20</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 4:1795.

<sup>21</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:833.

<sup>22</sup> Rifā‘a divorced his wife Tāmīma three times. So that he could legally marry her again, she first married ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Zabīr, who divorced her without relations taking place; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭī‘āb*, 2:500.

Category 60  
THE DATES OF TRANSMITTERS  
(*Ma'rifat tawārikh al-ruwāt*)

---

These dates include the deathdates and birthdates of the Companions, transmitters of ḥadīth and other scholars, as well as how long they lived and the like. We heard that Sufyān al-Thawrī said, “When transmitters use falsehood, we employ dates (*al-ta'rikh*) against them.” We heard that Ḥafṣ b. Ghiyāth said, “When you have suspicions about a teacher, settle his account by years,” – that is, reckon his age and the age of those from whom he wrote ḥadīth. This is similar to what we heard from Ismā'īl b. 'Ayyāsh:<sup>1</sup> “I was in Iraq and the scholars of ḥadīth came to me and said, ‘There is a man who transmits ḥadīth from Khālid b. Ma'dān<sup>2</sup> over there.’ I went to him and said, ‘In which year did you write ḥadīth from Khālid b. Ma'dān?’ He said, ‘In the year 13’ – that is, 113 [731 AD]. I said, ‘Do you claim that you heard ḥadīth from Khālid b. Ma'dān seven years after his death?’”

Ismā'īl said that Khālid died in 106. We heard a similar story which transpired between 'Ufayr b. Ma'dān<sup>3</sup> and someone who transmitted from Khālid b. Ma'dān. There 'Ufayr stated that Khālid died in 104.

We heard that Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Hākim said, “When Abū Ja'far Muḥammad b. Ḥātim al-Kashshī<sup>4</sup> came to us and transmitted ḥadīth from 'Abd b. Ḥumayd, I asked him about the year of his birth. He said that he was born in 260 [874 AD]. I said to our fellows, ‘This teacher heard ḥadīth from 'Abd b. Ḥumayd thirteen years after his death.’”<sup>5</sup>

We read that Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥumaydī al-Andalusi said something the gist of which was: there are three elements of the sciences of ḥadīth to which the student should first turn his attention:

1. Defects found in ḥadīth (*qilal*): the best book written on this is Dāraqutnī's.<sup>6</sup>

---

1 Abū 'Utba Ismā'īl b. 'Ayyāsh al-Himṣī (ca. 108/726–ca. 181/797) was a famous Syrian ḥadīth expert; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:312–28.

2 The renowned expert in ḥadīth and practical law, Abū 'Abd Allāh Khālid b. Ma'dān al-Himṣī was also known for his piety. As will be seen, the exact year of his death was disputed; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 4:536–41.

3 Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*, 4(1):81–2; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 3(2):36.

4 Very little was known about Muḥammad b. Ḥātim; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:380–1.

5 This does not accord with the date usually given for the death of 'Abd b. Ḥumayd, namely 249/863.

6 *Kitāb al-'Ilal al-mārida fi 'l-aḥādīth al-Nabawīya*, ed. Maḥfūz al-Rāḥmān Zayn Allāh al-Salafi (Riyadh, 1405/1985).

2. Homographic [names and gentilics]: the best book written on that is Ibn Mākūlā's [*al-Ikmāl*].
3. The deathdates of teachers: there is no book on this.

There has in fact been more than one book written on the subject of deathdates; however, they are neither exhaustive nor comprehensive. The books on the “dates” (*tawārikh*) of the transmitters of ḥadīth include deathdates and, for that and similar reasons, they were called “Dates.” This title is not appropriate for the personality criticism and the like which they also contain. God knows best. Let us now mention the essentials of this subject.

1. The correct age of our lord, the lord of mankind, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and his Companions Abū Bakr and ‘Umar [at the time of their death] was sixty-three [lunar] years. The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) was taken up on the morning of Monday,<sup>7</sup> the 12th of Rabi‘ al-Awwal, of the year 11 after the Emigration [7 June 632].

Abū Bakr passed away in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 13 [August 634].

‘Umar died in Dhu ’l-Hijja of the year 23 [October 644].

‘Uthmān died in Dhu ’l-Hijja of the year 35 [June 656] at the age of eighty-two – the age of ninety and others are also given.

‘Ali died in the month of Ramadān of the year 40 [January 661] at the age of sixty-three – sixty-four and sixty-five are also given.

Talḥa and al-Zubayr both died in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 36 [December 656]. We heard from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim that they were the same age, sixty-four years.<sup>8</sup> Others have contradicted al-Ḥākim.

Sa‘d b. Abī Waqqāṣ died, according to the best opinion, in the year 55 [675 AD] at the age of seventy-three.

Sa‘id b. Zayd<sup>9</sup> died in the year 51 [671 AD] at the age of seventy-three or seventy-four.

‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf<sup>10</sup> died in the year 32 [653 AD] at the age of seventy-five.

<sup>7</sup> This date was actually a Sunday.

<sup>8</sup> *Ulūm al-ḥadīth*, 203.

<sup>9</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭi‘āb*, 2:614–20.

<sup>10</sup> Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭi‘āb*, 2:844–50.

Abū ‘Ubayda b. al-Jarrāḥ died in the year 18 [639 AD] at the age of fifty-eight.

There are disagreements which I have not brought up concerning some of what I have said. God knows best.

2. Two Companions lived [about] sixty years in pre-Islamic times and [about] sixty years in Islam and both died in Medina in the year 54 [674 AD]. One was Ḥakīm b. Ḥizām<sup>11</sup> and he was born inside the Kaaba thirteen years before the Year of the Elephant.<sup>12</sup> The second was the Anṣārītē Ḥassān b. Thābit b. al-Mundhir b. Ḥarām. Ibn Ishāq related that he, his father Thābit, al-Mundhir and Ḥarām all lived one hundred and twenty years. The expert Abū Nu‘aym [al-İsbahānī?] said that he did not know the like of this among the Arabs. Alternatively some say that Ḥassān died in the year 50. God knows best.

3. The eponyms of the five legal schools having followers.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh Sufyān b. Sa‘īd al-Thawrī indisputably died in al-Baṣra in 161 [778 AD] and his birth was in the year 97 [716 AD].

Mālik b. Anas (God be pleased with him) died in Medina in 179 [795 AD] – a year before 180.<sup>13</sup> His birthdate is disputed. The years 93 [712 AD], 91, 94 and 97 have all been suggested. God knows best.

Abū Ḥanīfa (God bless him) died in 150 [767 AD] in Baghdad at the age of seventy.

Shāfi‘ī (God bless him) died at the end of Rajab of the year 204 [January 820] in Egypt and he was born in 150 [767 AD].

Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ḥanbal died in Baghdad in Rabi‘ al-Ākhir of the year 241 [August 855] and he was born in 164 [780 AD]. God knows best.

4. The authors of the five reliable books of hadith.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī was born on Friday – after the Friday prayer – the 13th of Shawwāl of the year 194 [20 July 810]. He died in Khartank, in the vicinity of Samarqand, the night of the ʻId al-Fiṭr in the year 256 [1 September 870]. His age was thirteen days short of sixty-two years.

11 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭiqāb*, 1:362–3.

12 The Year of the Elephant was traditionally dated 570 AD.

13 This last clause was apparently included to prevent the misreading of “seventy” for “ninety,” which when written out in Arabic look very similar. In this regard, Dhahabī remarked, “How often seven is misread for nine!” *Ṣiyar*, 10:648.

Muslim b. al-Hajjāj al-Nisābūrī died in Nishapur on the 25th of Rajab of the year 261 [5 May 875] at the age of fifty-five.

Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān b. al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī died in al-Baṣra in Shawwāl of the year 275 [February 889].

Abū Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad b. Ḫaṣā al-Sulamī al-Tirmidhī died in Tirmidh on the 13th of Rajab of the year 279 [9 October 892].

Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb al-Nasā'i died in the year 303 [915 AD]. God knows best.

## 5. Seven later experts who composed excellent books which have proved useful in our times.

Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Ali b. 'Umar al-Dāraqutnī al-Baghdādī died in Baghdad in Dhu 'l-Qa'da of the year 385 [December 995]. He was born in Dhu 'l-Qa'da of the year 306 [April 919].

Then came Abū 'Abd Allāh b. al-Bayyīc al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī who died in Nishapur in Ṣafar of the year 405 [August 1014]. He was born there in the month of Rabi' al-Awwal of the year 321 [March 933].

Then came the ḥadīth expert of Egypt, Abū Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ghanī b. Sa'īd al-Azdī, who was born in Dhu 'l-Qa'da of the year 332 [June 945]. He died in Egypt in Ṣafar of the year 409 [July 1018].

Then came the expert Abū Nu'aym Aḥmad b. 'Abd Allāh al-İsbahānī, who was born in 334 [946 AD]. He died in Ṣafar of the year 430 [November 1038] in Isfahan.

In another generation there was the ḥadīth expert of the North Africans Abū 'Amr b. 'Abd al-Barr al-Namārī, who was born in Rabi' al-Ākhir of the year 368 [November 978]. He died in Shāṭība in al-Andalus in the month of Rabi' al-Ākhir of the year 463 [January 1071].

Then came Abū Bakr Ahmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Bayhaqī, who was born in the year 384 [994 AD]. He died in Nishapur in Jumādā al-Ūlā of the year 458 [May 1066]. His body was taken to Bayhaq and buried there.

Then came Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, who was born in Jumādā al-Ākhira of the year 392 [April 1002] and died in Baghdad in Dhu 'l-Hijja of the year 463 [September 1071]. God bless them, us and all Muslims. God knows best.

## Category 61

### RELIABLE AND WEAK TRANSMITTERS OF ḤADĪTH

(*Ma‘rifat al-thiqāt wa-’l-du‘afā’ min ruwāt al-ḥadīth*)

This is one of the most exalted and grandest disciplines. It is the staircase to knowledge of the soundness and sickness of ḥadīth. The ḥadīth scholars have many works on it. Some are devoted exclusively to weak transmitters of ḥadīth, like Bukhārī’s *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’* (*Book of Weak Transmitters*), Nasā’i’s *al-Du‘afā’*,<sup>1</sup> Uqaylī’s *al-Du‘afā’*<sup>2</sup> and others. Some concern only reliable transmitters, like Abū Ḥātim b. Ḥibbān’s *Kitāb al-Thiqāt* (*Book of Reliable Transmitters*). Some cover both reliable and unreliable transmitters, for instance Bukhārī’s *Ta‘rīkh*<sup>3</sup> (*History*), Ibn Abī Khaythamā’s *Ta‘rīkh* – How rich it is in useful information! – and Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī’s *Kitāb al-Jarh wa-’l-ta‘dil* (*Book of Personality Criticism*).

We heard that the expert Ṣāliḥ b. Muḥammad, nicknamed “Jazara,” said, “The first person to talk about ḥadīth transmitters was Shu‘ba b. al-Hajjāj. Yahyā b. Sa‘id al-Qattān followed him and Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and Yahyā b. Ma‘īn came after that.” And these.<sup>4</sup> He means that Shu‘ba was the first to apply himself seriously to this and concern himself with it. However, speaking about transmitters, to accredit and discredit, has an established precedent from the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) and from many of the Companions and Followers as well as those after them. Personality criticism was made permissible in order to defend the Holy Law (*al-shari‘a*) and to banish error and falsehood from it. Discrediting transmitters is licit just as is discrediting witnesses in court. I heard that Abū Bakr b. Khallād<sup>5</sup> said, “I asked Yahyā b. Sa‘id [al-Qattān], ‘Are you not afraid that those people whose ḥadīth you have rejected will become your adversaries before God on the Day of Resurrection?’ He replied, ‘I prefer having them as my adversaries to having the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) as my adversary and saying to me, ‘Why did you not protect my ḥadīth from falsehood?’’” We heard or read that the ascetic Abū Turāb al-Nakhshabī

1. Bukhārī’s *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ al-ṣaghīr* and Nasā’i’s *al-Du‘afā’ wa-’l-matrūkin* are published in *al-Majmū‘ fi ’l-du‘afā’ wa-’l-matrūkin*, ed. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Izz al-Dīn Shirwān (Beirut, 1405/1985).

2. Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ‘Amr b. Mūsā al-Uqaylī (d. 322/934; Sezgin, GAS, 1:177) was a ḥadīth scholar best known for his *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ al-kabīr*, ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘tī Amin Qal‘ajī, 4 vols (Beirut, 1404/1984).

3. Bukhārī wrote three works with *ta‘rīkh* in their title, namely *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*, *al-Ta‘rīkh al-awṣaṭ* (ed. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Lahīdān, 2 vols, Riyad, 1418/1998) and *al-Ta‘rīkh al-ṣaghīr* (ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid, 2 vols, Beirut, 1406/1986).

4. What this means is unclear. See Prof. ‘Abd al-Rahmān’s comment in *Mugaddima*, 655, n. 1.

5. Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 3(2):246.

6. Abū Turāb ‘Askar b. al-Ḥusayn al-Nakhshabī (d. 245/859) was a highly respected mystic; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 11:545–6.

heard some remarks critical of transmitters from Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and said to him, “Teacher, do not slander scholars!” Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal replied, “Woe to you! This is good advice, not slander.”

The beginner in personality criticism should fear God (He is blessed and exalted), proceed with caution and be on guard against laxness, to avoid discrediting a sound individual and imputing something bad to an innocent man, the shame of which will remain with him<sup>7</sup> for ages. I think that Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān b. Abī Ḥātim – and they say he used to be considered a saint (*min al-abdāl*) – feared something similar to what I mentioned. According to the report we heard or read, Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusayn al-Rāzī<sup>8</sup> – that is, the Sufi – went up to ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān while he was reciting his book [that is, his *Kitāb al-Jarḥ wa-l-ta‘dil*] and said to him, “How many of these people unsaddled their mounts in heaven a century or two ago while you talk about them and slander them?” ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān wept. He also read that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn was quoted to him while he was reciting that book of his to the people: “Truly we are defaming people who may have unsaddled their mounts in heaven more than two centuries ago.” ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān wept and his hands trembled so much that the book fell from them.

More than one critic has made mistakes about people, falsely discrediting them. An example of this is Abū ‘Abd al-Rāḥmān, al-Nasā’i’s discreditation of Ahmad b. Ṣalih. The latter was a reliable expert and authority to whom no discredit can adhere: Bukhārī included his ḥadīth in his *Sahīh*. An instance of impoliteness on the part of Ahmad b. Ṣalih toward Nasā’i corrupted the latter’s heart against him. We heard that the expert Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalili said, “The experts agree that Nasā’i’s condemnation of him was a case of personal prejudice and the remarks of the likes of Nasā’i cannot impugn Ahmad b. Ṣalih.”<sup>9</sup> Nasā’i was in fact an authoritative guide in personality criticism. When something like this is ascribed to someone like him, the reason is that anger has blinded him so that good qualities appear to be bad ones. Someone like Nasā’i does not deliberately discredit a transmitter for something he knows to be false. So note this for it is a significant and precious point. Remarks on the rules of personality criticism have already appeared in Category 23. God knows best.

7 It is unclear to me whether the shame will stick to the falsely criticized transmitter or his accuser.

8 Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusayn al-Rāzī (d. 304/917) was a disciple of the great Egyptian mystic Dhu l-Nūn; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 14:248–51.

9 *Irshād*, 1:424.

## Chapter 62

### RELIABLE TRANSMITTERS WHO CONFUSED THEIR HADITH AT THE END OF THEIR LIFE

(*Ma'rifat man khallaṭa fī akhir 'umrihi min al-thiqāt*)

I am not aware that anyone has written a monograph on or seriously concerned himself with this valuable and important discipline, although it is very deserving of that. Those who confuse their ḥadīth at the end of their life fall into various subcategories. These include those who confused their ḥadīth on account of their becoming disordered and senile and those who became confused because of losing their eyesight or some other reason. The verdict regarding them is that the ḥadīth of someone who studied with them before they became disordered are acceptable. One cannot accept the ḥadīth of someone who studied with them after they became disordered or someone whose case is unclear; that is, it is not known whether he studied with the transmitter before he became disordered or after. For instance,

‘Atā’ b. al-Sā’ib<sup>1</sup> became disordered at the end of his life. Scholars cite as proofs the relations of his older students, like Sufyān al-Thawrī and Shu‘ba [b. al-Hajjāj], from him, because they heard ḥadīth from him when he was sound. Scholars do not cite the relation of someone who heard from him at the end of his life. Yāḥyā b. Sa‘īd al-Qatṭān said about Shu‘ba, “[The ḥadīth Sufyān and Shu‘ba transmitted from him are sound,<sup>2</sup>] except two regarding which Shu‘ba used to say, ‘I heard them at the last [from ‘Atā’] from Zādhān.’”<sup>3</sup>

Abū Ishaq al-Sabī‘ī also became disordered. It is said that Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna heard ḥadīth from him after he became disordered. Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalili stated this.<sup>4</sup>

Sa‘īd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī<sup>5</sup> became disordered and his retention went bad before his death. Abu ’l-Walid [Sulaymān b. Khalaf] al-Bājī al-Mālikī said that Nasā‘ī said, “His ḥadīth became worthy of rejection in the days of the Plague.”<sup>6</sup> In our opinion, he – that is, what was heard from him

1 ‘Atā’ b. al-Sā’ib al-Kūfi (his *kunya* is disputed) died in 136/754; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:110–14.

2 Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:111.

3 Abū ‘Umar Zādhān al-Kindī was born during the lifetime of the Prophet and died in 82/701; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:280–1.

4 *Irshād*, 1:355.

5 Abū Mas‘ūd Sa‘īd b. Iyās al-Jurayrī (d. 144/761) was a Baṣrān expert in ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:153–6.

6 Nothing I have read identifies which plague is meant here. The Plague of Salm b. Qutayba which struck al-Baṣra in 131/749 and was especially deadly would appear to be a likely candidate, if indeed a specific event was intended.

before the time of the Plague – was more trustworthy than Khālid al-Ḥadhdhā.

Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba: Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn said, “Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba confused his ḥadīth after the defeat of Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥasan b. Ḥasan in the year 42, that is 142 [759 AD].<sup>7</sup> Those who heard ḥadīth from him after that are worthless. The audition of Yazīd b. Hārūn from him is sound. He heard ḥadīth from him in Wāṣīṭ while Ibn Abī ‘Arūba was on his way to al-Kūfa. The most trustworthy person who heard ḥadīth from him was ‘Abada b. Sulaymān.”<sup>8</sup> Waki‘ [b. al-Jarrāḥ] and al-Mu‘afā b. ʻImrān al-Mawṣili<sup>9</sup> are among those who are known to have heard ḥadīth from him after he became disordered. We read that Ibn ‘Ammār al-Mawṣili<sup>10</sup> – one of the experts – said, “Their relation from him is worthless. They heard ḥadīth from him after he became disordered.” We heard that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn said to Wakī‘, “You transmit ḥadīth from Sa‘īd b. Abī ‘Arūba and you heard from him only while he was disordered?” He replied, “Have you seen me transmit anything but good ḥadīth from him?”

Mas‘ūdī<sup>11</sup> was one of those who became disordered. He is ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Utba b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd al-Hudhalī, the brother of Abu ’l-Umays ‘Utba al-Mas‘ūdī.<sup>12</sup> Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Hākim stated in *Kitāb al-Muzakkin li-’l-ruwāt* that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn said, “Whoever heard ḥadīth from Mas‘ūdī in the time of [the caliph] Abū Ja‘far [al-Manṣūr, r. 136/754–158/775] has a sound audition. Whoever heard ḥadīth from him in the days of [the caliph] al-Mahdī [r. 158/775–169/785] has a worthless audition.” Ḥanbal b. Ishāq said that Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said, “The auditions of ‘Āsim – he is Ibn ‘Alī – Abu ’l-Naḍr [Hāshim b. al-Qāsim, nicknamed “Qayṣar”] and those others from Mas‘ūdī date from after he became disordered.

<sup>7</sup> Rabi‘at al-Ra‘y b. Abī ‘Abd al-Rahmān, the professor of Mālik: it is said that he went bad at the end of his life and for that reason reliance on him is unacceptable.

Şālih b. Nabhān, the client of al-Tawwāma bint Umayya b. Khalaf: Ibn Abī Dhīb and many others transmitted ḥadīth from him. Abū Ḥātim b.

7 The revolt of Ibrāhīm and his brother Muḥammad, known as “al-Nasf al-Zakiya,” against the Caliph al-Manṣūr actually took place in 145/762–3; *EP*, 3:983–5

8 Abū Muḥammad ‘Abada (the pronunciation “Abda” also seems to be possible) b. Sulaymān al-Kilābī al-Kūfi died in 188/804 in al-Kūfa; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 8:511.

9 Al-Mu‘afā b. ʻImrān al-Mawṣili was a historian who wrote a *Ta‘rikh Mawṣil*; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:348.

10 Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ammār al-Mawṣili (d. 242/856 or 231) wrote a work on transmitters and the defects in ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 11:469–70.

11 Mas‘ūdī (d. 160/777) was a prominent ḥadīth transmitter and jurist; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:93–5.

12 Abu ’l-Umays died around 150/767; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 7:20.

Hibbān said, “He went bad in 125 [743 AD]. His late ḥadīth became mixed up with his early ones and cannot be separated. Therefore, they should be rejected.”<sup>13</sup>

Huṣayn b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Kūfi<sup>14</sup> was one of those who became disordered and went bad. Nasā’i and others said this. God knows best.

‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Thaqafī.<sup>15</sup> Ibn Abī Hātim al-Rāzī said that Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn said, “He became disordered in the end.”<sup>16</sup>

Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna: I came across the remark of Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Ammār al-Mawṣili that he heard Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn saying, “I swear that Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna became disordered in [1]97 [813 AD]. The audition of those who heard from him in that year and afterwards is worthless.” Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna died about two years later, in 199.

‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām: Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal said that he went blind at the end of his life. He used to be prompted and he responded to it. The audition of those who heard ḥadīth from him after he became blind is worthless. Nasā’i said, “There are doubts regarding him on account of those who wrote ḥadīth from him at the last.” The statement of ‘Abbās b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīm [al-‘Anbarī] made upon his return from Sana refers to this: “By God, I went to great trouble to see ‘Abd al-Razzāq and he is a liar. Even Wāqidi is more veracious than he.” In what is related from Tabarānī I came across some ḥadīth from Iṣhāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Dabārī<sup>17</sup> from ‘Abd al-Razzāq which I vehemently reject. I attribute the state of those ḥadīth to that circumstance. Dabārī heard ḥadīth from him very late. Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī said, “When ‘Abd al-Razzāq died, Dabārī was six or seven years old.” [NB] There are also doubts regarding many of the elevated ḥadīth coming from those who heard from Sufyān b. ‘Uyayna and those like him late in their life.

Ārim, that is, Abu ‘l-Nu‘mān Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl, became disordered at the last. The ḥadīth which Bukhārī, Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā al-Dhuhlī and the other experts related from him must have been taken from him before he became disordered.

<sup>13</sup> *Majrūḥin*, 1:366.

<sup>14</sup> The sources maintain that there were a number of notable individuals named “Huṣayn b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Kūfi” living at the same time. The one in question here may be Abu ‘l-Hudhayl al-Sulamī (ca. 43/663–130/748); Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:422–4.

<sup>15</sup> Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Wahhab b. ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Thaqafī (ca. 108/726–194/810) is said to have gone bad three or four years before his death; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 9:237–41.

<sup>16</sup> *Jarh*, 3(1):71.

<sup>17</sup> Abū Ya‘qūb Iṣhāq b. Ibrāhīm al-Dabārī heard ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Hammām at an early age under the supervision of his father and died in Sana in 285/898; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:416–18.

Abū Qilāba ‘Abd al-Malik b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Raqāshī: we heard that the authority Ibn Khuzayma said, “Abū Qilāba transmitted ḥadīth to us in al-Baṣra before he became disordered and went to Baġhdad.”

Later scholars whom we read that about.

Abū Aḥmad al-Ghiṭrīfī al-Jurjānī<sup>18</sup> and Abū Tāhir,<sup>19</sup> the grandson of the authority Ibn Khuzayma. The expert Abū ‘Alī al-Bardha‘ī – and later “al-Samarqandī” – said in his *Mu‘jam* that he read that they became disordered at the end of their life.

Abū Bakr b. Mālik al-Qaṭī‘ī – the transmitter of the *Musnad* and other works of Aḥmad [b. Ḥanbal] – declined at the end of his life and became senile to the extent that he could not recognize anything that was recited to him.

Be aware that on the whole we know that the ḥadīth of the transmitters of this type cited in one or both of the *Sahīhs* have been separated [from their weak ḥadīth] and were taken from them before they became disordered. God knows best.

<sup>18</sup> Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ghiṭrīfī al-Jurjānī (ca. 280/893–377/987) was a well-traveled transmitter of ḥadīth; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:203.

<sup>19</sup> Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl b. Muḥammad b. Ishaq b. Khuzayma al-Nisābūri (d. 387/997) was regarded as an expert in his grandfather’s ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:490–1.

## Category 63

### THE GENERATIONS OF TRANSMITTERS AND SCHOLARS

(*Ma‘rifat ṭabaqāt al-ruwāt wa-’l-‘ulamā’*)

---

This is one of the important subjects, ignorance of which has disgraced several writers and other scholars. *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabir* of Muḥammad b. Sa‘d – the amanuensis of Wāqidī – is full of useful information. Muḥammad b. Sa‘d is reliable despite the fact that in his book he relates many reports from weak transmitters including Wāqidī – and he is the “Muḥammad b. ‘Umar” whose gentilic Ibn Sa‘d does not give.

In common parlance, “generation” signifies a group of people with something in common. Given this, there may often be two people who belong to a single generation because they are alike in one respect and who belong to different generations in relation to something else which they do not have in common. Thus, Anas b. Mālik al-Anṣārī and other younger Companions belong to the same generation as the Ten [who were given the glad tidings of their entrance into heaven] and the other early Companions, when we examine their similarity in respect to the basic principle of the attribute of “Companionship.” Reckoned thus, all of the Companions are a first generation, the Followers are a second generation, the followers of the Followers are a third generation and so on. When we examine the differences of the Companions in regard to their relative priority and rank, they are, as we mentioned earlier, distributed through more than ten generations. By this measure, Anas and the other younger Companions are not in the same generation as the Ten, but rather they are several generations below them. The researcher working in this discipline needs to know the birthdates and deathdates of ḥadīth transmitters as well as who their teachers were and who their students were, and the like. God knows best.

## Category 64

### TRANSMITTERS OF HADITH AND OTHER SCHOLARS WHO WERE CLIENTS

(*Ma'rifat al-mawāli min al-ruwāt wa-'l-`ulamā'*)

---

The most important aspect of this subject is the recognition of those clients who bear tribal gentilics with no qualification. The presumption regarding someone bearing a gentilic referring to a certain tribe – for instance when one says, “X, the Qurashite” – is that he is connected by blood to them. For that reason, it is crucial to make clear regarding someone called a “Qurashite” that he was called this because he was a client of theirs. Be aware that when a transmitter or scholar is described as “the client of X” or “the client of the tribe of X,” this most often means that he was a freedman (*mawla 'l-`atāqa*).

The term “client” is applied to some transmitters with the sense of “clientage by conversion to Islam” (*malā' al-islām*). An example is Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Bukhārī. He is Muḥammad b. Isma'īl al-Ju'fī, a client of the Ju'fites. He bears the gentilic “Ju'fī” because one of his ancestors – and I think that he was the one called “al-Aḥnaf” and he had been a Majian – converted to Islam at the hand of al-Yamān b. al-Akhnaṣ al-Ju'fī; that is, the ancestor of 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Musnādī al-Ju'fī,<sup>1</sup> one of the teachers of Bukhārī. Another example is al-Ḥasan b. Ḥiṣā al-Ḥāfiẓ,<sup>2</sup> the client of 'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak. He was a client of Ibn al-Mubārak because he converted to Islam at his hands. He had been a Christian.

Some others were clients on the basis of clientage of alliance and protection (*walā' al-hilf wa-'l-muwālat*), like the *imām* Mālik b. Anas. His folks were Ḥimyarite Aṣbahites by blood. They were clients by alliance of the Taym of the Qurashites. Some say this was because his grandfather, Mālik b. Abī 'Āmir, was an *asif* – that is a “hired hand” – of Ṭalḥā b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Taymī and Ṭalḥā used to travel about as a trader. Others say that Mālik b. Abī 'Āmir was called “the client of the Taymītes” because of his being with Ṭalḥā b. 'Ubayd Allāh al-Taymī. This is a fourth subcategory of clientage. It is similar to what we said above [in Category 58] about Miqṣam, namely that he was described as “the client of Ibn 'Abbās” because of his close association with him.

\* The following are examples of clients who bear tribal gentilics.

The Follower Abu 'l-Bakhtārī Sa'īd b. Fayrūz al-Ṭā'i.<sup>3</sup> He was a client of the tribe of Tay'.

---

1 Abu Ja'far al-Musnadī was described as “the ḥadīth authority in Transoxiana in his era.” He died in 229/844 at over ninety years of age; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 10:658–60.

2 Abū 'Alī al-Ḥasan b. Ḫiṣā b. Māṣarjīs al-Nisābūrī (d. 240/854 or 239) was a popular teacher in Baghdad; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 12:27–30.

3 Abu 'l-Bakhtārī was a jurist who died in the Battle of al-Jamājim in 82/701; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:279–80.

The Follower Abu 'l-Āliya Rufay' al-Riyāḥī al-Tamīmī. He was the client of a woman of the Banū Riyāḥ.

Abū Dāwūd 'Abd al-Rahmān b. Hurmuz al-Araj al-Hāshimī, the transmitter from Abū Hurayra, Ibn Buḥayna and others. He was a client of the Banū Hāshim.

Al-Layth b. Sa'īd al-Miṣrī al-Fahmī was a client of the subtribe of Fahm.

'Abd Allāh b. al-Mubārak al-Marwazī al-Hānzalī was a client of the tribe of Hānzala.

'Abd Allāh b. Wahb al-Miṣrī al-Qurashī was a client of the Quraysh.

'Abd Allāh b. Ṣalīḥ al-Miṣrī al-Juhānī<sup>4</sup> – the amanuensis of al-Layth b. Sa'īd – was a client of the tribe of Juhayna.

Sometimes a transmitter bore the gentilic of a tribe because he was the client of a client of that tribe. An example is Abu 'l-Ḥubāb Sa'īd b. Yasār al-Hāshimī,<sup>5</sup> the transmitter from Abū Hurayra and ['Abd Allāh] b. 'Umar. He was a client of a client of the Banū Hāshim because he was the client of Shuqrān,<sup>6</sup> the client of the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him).

We heard that Zuhri said,

I went to [the caliph] 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān and he said, "Zuhri, where are you coming from?" I said, "From Mecca." He said, "Whom did you leave there to lead the people of Mecca?" I said, "'Aṭā' b. Abī Rabāh.'" He said, "Is he an Arab or a client?" I said, "He is a client." He said, "How did he come to lead them?" I said, "By religiosity and transmission." He said, "It is right for those possessing religiosity and transmissions to lead. Who leads the people of the Yemen?" I said, "Tāwūs b. Kaysān." He said, "Is he an Arab or a client?" I said, "He is a client." He said, "How did he come to lead them?" I said, "The same way 'Aṭā' came to lead." He said, "That is the way it should be. Who leads the people of Egypt?" I said, "Yazid b. Abī Ḥabib."<sup>7</sup> He said, "Is he an Arab or a client?" I said, "He is a client." He said, "Who leads the people of Syria?" I said, "Makhlūl." He said, "Is he an Arab or a client?" I said, "He is a client, a Nubian slave of a Hudhaylite woman who eventually freed him." He said, "Who leads the people of al-Jazira?" I said, "Maymūn b. Mihrān."<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Dhahabi, among others, had doubts about the reliability of 'Abd Allāh b. Ṣalīḥ (137/754–223/837) as a transmitter of ḥadīth; *Siyar*, 10:405–16.

<sup>5</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta'rikh al-kabīr*, 2(1):520; Ibn Abī Ḥatīm, *Jārh*, 2(1):72.

<sup>6</sup> Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *Iṣṭikāb*, 2:709–10.

<sup>7</sup> This highly respected transmitter died in 128/746; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 6:31–3.

<sup>8</sup> Abū Ayyūb Maymūn b. Mihrān al-Jazārī al-Raqqī (40/660–117/735 or 116) was a respected authority in law and ḥadīth; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 5:71–8.

He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Who leads the people of Khurāsān?” I said, “Al-Ḍahḥāk b. Muzāḥīm”<sup>9</sup> He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Who leads the people of al-Baṣra?” I said, “Al-Ḥasan b. Abi ’l-Ḥasan.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is a client.” He said, “Woe to you! Who leads the people of al-Kūfā?” I said, “Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaī.” He said, “Is he an Arab or a client?” I said, “He is an Arab.” He said, “Woe to you, Zuhri! You relieved me. By God, the clients lord over the Arabs to the extent that they preach to them from on top of the minbars while the Arabs are below them.” I said, “Prince of the Believers, it is a matter of God and His religion. Whoever keeps it leads and whoever loses it falls.”

We hear that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Zayd b. Aslam<sup>10</sup> said, “When the ‘‘Abd Allāhs’’<sup>11</sup> died, the law in all of the cities, except Medina, went to the clients. God specially blessed Medina with a Qurashite and the jurist of the inhabitants of Medina, was, without a doubt, Sa‘id b. al-Musayyib.” There is some bias in this. At that time, there were other famous Arab jurists in addition to Ibn al-Musayyib, including Sha‘bī and Nakhaī. All of the “Seven Jurists,”<sup>12</sup> including Ibn al-Musayyib, were Arabs, except Sulaymān b. Yasār. God knows best.

---

<sup>9</sup> Al-Ḍahḥāk (d. 102/721 or 105 or 106) was best known for his expertise in Qurān commentary; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 4:598–600.

<sup>10</sup> ‘Abd al-Raḥmān died in 182/798; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 8:349.

<sup>11</sup> See above, Category 39.

<sup>12</sup> See above, Category 40.

## Category 65

### THE RESIDENCES AND LANDS OF TRANSMITTERS

(*Ma‘rifat awṭān al-ruwāt wa-buldānihim*)

---

This is one of the matters which the experts of ḥadīth need to know for many of their activities, and Ibn Sa‘d’s *Tabaqāt* is one of the prime sources for this information. The Arabs used to take their gentilics only from their tribe. When Islam appeared and most of them settled in villages and cities, they started to derive their gentilics from their place of residence, just as the non-Arabs had been doing. Many of them lost their [original tribal] gentilics and were left with only the ones referring to their place of residence.

If someone moves from one place to another and wants to include both places as his gentilic, let him begin with the first place and then give the second one he moved to. It is a good idea for the word “then” (*thumma*) to be added to the second. So for someone who moved, for instance, from Egypt to Syria, one should say, “X, the Egyptian, then the Damascene.” An inhabitant of a village in the vicinity of a town may use the gentilic of the village and that of the town, as well as that of the region where the town is located.

Let us follow the example of the expert Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim and relate ḥadīth with their isnāds, drawing attention to where the transmitters lived. It is commendable for the expert to give the ḥadīth with its isnād and then mention the homelands of its transmitters and other facts about them, one by one, [for example]

- [1.] The long-lived teacher and great transmitter Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar b. Muḥammad b. al-Mu‘ammar<sup>1</sup> (God bless him) informed me through my recitation to him in Baghdad: Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Bāqī b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī<sup>2</sup> informed us. He said, Abū Iṣhāq Ibrāhīm b. ‘Umar b. Aḥmad al-Barmakī<sup>3</sup> informed us. He said, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh b. Ibrāhīm b. Ayyūb b. Māsī<sup>4</sup> informed us. He said, Abū Muslim Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kajjī<sup>5</sup> informed us. He said, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī informed us:

---

1 This is the famous Ibn Ṭabarzadah al-Baghdādi (516/1123–607/1210), who possessed short isnāds for a number of important ḥadīth collections; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 21:507–12.

2 This transmitter, popularly known as Qādī ‘I-l-Maristān (442/1050–535/1141), studied many subjects before repenting and devoting himself to the study of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 20:23–8.

3 Abū Iṣhāq al-Barmakī (361/972–445/1054) was another long-lived transmitter of ḥadīth; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 17:605–6.

4 Ibn Māsī was born in 274/887 and died in 369/980; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 16:252–3.

5 Kajjī (ca. 190/806–292/904) was a popular transmitter because he had a number of ḥadīth, like the one cited here, in which only three intermediaries separated him from the Prophet; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 13:423–5.

Sulaymān [b. Tarkhān] al-Taymī informed us from Anas [b. Mālik]. He said, the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, “There is no disassociation among [quarreling] Muslims for longer than three days,” or he said, “three nights.”

- [2a] The teacher and great transmitter Abu ’l-Ḥasan al-Mu’ayyad b. Muhammad b. ‘Ali al-Muqrī<sup>6</sup> (God bless him) informed me by my recitation to him in Nishapur, once beginning anew with the recitation at the head of the grave of Muslim b. al-Hajjāj. The jurist of the Holy City Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Fadl al-Furāwī informed us at the grave of Muslim. *Hādī*<sup>6</sup>
- [2b.] Umm al-Mu’ayyad Zaynab bint Abi ’l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rī [sic] (God bless her) informed me, once through my recitation to her in Nishapur and another time through the recitation of someone else. I said, Ismā‘il b. Abi ’l-Qāsim b. Abi Bakr al-Qārī<sup>7</sup> informed you through recitation to him.

[Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Furāwī and Qārī] said, Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar b. Aḥmad b. Masrūr informed us: Abū ‘Amr Ismā‘il b. Nujayd al-Sulamī informed us: Abū Muslim Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Kajjī informed us: Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī informed us: Ḥumayd al-Ṭawil<sup>8</sup> transmitted to me from Anas b. Mālik. He said, “The Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) said, ‘Help your brother when he is doing wrong or being wronged.’ I said, ‘Messenger of God, I will help him when he is wronged, but how can I help him when he is doing wrong?’ He said, ‘Keep him from doing wrong. That is your help to him.’”

These two ḥadīth are elevated in audition with clean isnāds and sound texts. In the first, Anas and those after him until Abū Muslim are Baṣrans. Those after Abū Muslim to our teacher are Baghdadis. In the second ḥadīth, Anas and those after him until Abū Muslim are, as we said, Baṣrans. Those after him, from Ibn Nujayd until our teacher, are Nishapuris.

- [3.] The pure teacher Abu ’l-Faṭḥ Manṣūr b. ‘Abd al-Mun‘im b. Abi ’l-Barakāt (God bless him) – the son of the authority Abū ‘Abd

6 For this, see above pp. 142–3.

7 The Sufi Abū Muḥammad Ismā‘il b. Abi ’l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Abi Bakr Ṣalīḥ al-Qārī (439/1048–531/1137) was primarily known as a transmitter of the ḥadīth collection *Juz’ Ibn Nujayd*; Dhahabi, *Siyar*, 20:19–20.

8 The famous transmitter of ḥadīth Abū Ubayda Ḥumayd b. Abi Ḥumayd al-Baṣrī (68/687–142/759), known as Ḥumayd al-Ṭawil (Tall – or Long – Ḥumayd), was not actually tall, although his hands were said to be “long”; Sezgin, *GAS*, 1:89.

Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl al-Furāwī – informed me through my recitation to him in Nishapur: My grandfather Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. al-Faḍl informed us: Abū ‘Uthmān Sa‘īd b. Muḥammad al-Bahīrī<sup>9</sup> (God bless him) informed us: Abū Sa‘īd Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥamdūn<sup>10</sup> informed us. He said, Abū Ḥātim Makki b. ‘Abdān<sup>11</sup> informed us: ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr<sup>12</sup> informed us: ‘Abd al-Razzāq [b. Hammām] informed us: Ibn Jurayj informed us. He said, ‘Abada b. Abī Lubāba<sup>13</sup> informed me that Warrād,<sup>14</sup> the client of al-Mughira b. Shu‘ba, informed him that al-Mughira b. Shu‘ba wrote to [the caliph] Mu‘awiyā – Warrād wrote that letter for him – “When the Messenger of God (Peace be upon him) completed his prayer, I heard him say, ‘There is no god but God alone. He has no companion. Sovereignty and praise are His. God, no one can forbid when You give and no one can give when You forbid. No one’s fortunate position in the world can help him.’”

Al-Mughira b. Shu‘ba, Warrād and ‘Abada were Kūfans. Ibn Jurayj, Makki and ‘Abd al-Razzāq were from the city of Sana in the Yemen. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr, our teacher and all of those between them were Nishapuris.

To God (be He praised) belongs the most complete praise for the blessing He liberally bestows to the extent one requests and the degree one hopes for. The finest prayers and peace on our lord Muḥammad and his family and the rest of the prophets and their families. Amen! Amen! Amen!

<sup>9</sup> Bahīrī died in 451/1059; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 18:103–4.

<sup>10</sup> I have not found any information about this transmitter.

<sup>11</sup> Makki b. ‘Abdān died in 325/937 at over eighty years of age; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 15:70–1.

<sup>12</sup> As a young man ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Bishr traveled extensively with his father to hear ḥadīth. He returned to Nishapur where he taught until his death in 260/874; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 12:340–4.

<sup>13</sup> The merchant and ḥadīth transmitter ‘Abada (or ‘Abda) b. Abī Lubāba (d. ca. 127/745) settled in Damascus; Dhahabī, *Siyar*, 5:229–30.

<sup>14</sup> Bukhārī, *al-Ta’rīkh al-kabir*, 4(2):185–6; Ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Jarh*, 4(2):48.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- ‘Abd al-Ghani b. ‘Abd al-Wāhid al-Jamā‘ili. *Kitāb Miḥnat al-imām Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal*. Cairo, 1991.
- ‘Abd al-Ghanī al-Nābulusī. *Sharḥ mā ladaynā fī qawl al-muḥaddithīn “rawaynā.”* Maktabat al-Asad (Damascus), no. 14123, ff. 29a–31b.
- ‘Abd b. Ḥumayd. *al-Muntakhab min Musnad ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd*. Ed. Șubḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrā‘ī and Muḥammad Khalil al-Šā‘idī. Beirut, 1408/1988.
- Abū ‘Alī al-Jayyānī. *Kitāb al-Alqāb*. Ed. Muḥammad Abu ’l-Faḍl. Al-Muhammadiya, 1416/1996.
- Abū ‘Awāna. *Musnad Abī ‘Awāna*. 2 vols. Hyderabad, 1362–3.
- Abū Bakr al-Bazzār. *al-Baḥr al-Zakhkhar*. Ed. Maḥfūz al-Raḥmān Zayn Allāh. Medina, 1416/1996.
- Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī, Sulaymān b. al-Ash’ath. *Kitāb al-Sunan*. 4 vols. Ed. Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Hamid. Beirut, n.d.
- . *Risālat Abī Dāwūd ilā ahl Makka fī wasf Sunanīhī*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Luṭfī al-Şabbāgh. 3d edn. Beirut, 1405.
- Abū Nu‘aym al-Iṣbahānī. *Dhikr akhbār Iṣbahān*. Ed. S. Dederling. 2 vols. Leiden, 1931.
- . *Hilyat al-awliyā’ wa-ṭabaqāt al-āṣfiyā’*. 10 vols. Cairo, 1351/1932–1357/1938.
- Abū Shāma ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ismā‘il al-Maqdisī. *al-Dhayl ‘ala ’l-Rawḍatayn*. Ed. Muḥammad Zāhid b. al-Ḥasan al-Kawtharī. Cairo, 1366/1947.
- . *Mukhtaṣar Kitāb al-Mu’ammil li-’l-radd ila ’l-amr al-awwal in Majmū‘at al-Rasā’il al-Muniriyā*. 4 vols. Cairo, n.d.
- Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalilī, al-Khalil b. ‘Abd Allāh. *Kitāb al-Irshād fī ‘ulamā’ al-ḥadīth*. Ed. Muḥammad Sa‘id b. ʻUmar Idrīs. 3 vols. Riyadh, 1409/1989.
- Abū Ya‘lā al-Mawṣilī. *Musnad*. Ed. Ḥusayn Salīm Asad. 14 vols. Damascus, 1404/1984–1410/1990.
- Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal. *Kitāb al-‘Ilal wa-ma‘rifat al-rijāl*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1987.
- . *Musnad al-imām Aḥmad*. 6 vols. Cairo, 1311–13.
- Albānī, Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn. *Fahras makḥūṭāt Dār al-kutub al-Ζāhirīya: al-muntakhab min makḥūṭāt al-ḥadīth*. Damascus, 1390/1970.
- ‘Alī b. al-Ja‘dī. *al-Ja‘dīyāt*. Ed. Rifa‘at Fawzī ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. 2 vols. Cairo, 1415/1994.
- ‘Alī b. al-Madīnī. *al-‘Ilal*. Ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-A‘ẓamī. 2d. ed. Beirut, 1980.
- . *Tasmīyat man ruwīya ‘anhu min awlād al-‘ashara wa-ghayrihim min ašhāb Rasūl Allāh*. In *al-Ruwāt min al-ikhwa wa-’l-akhamāt*, ed. Bāsim Fayṣal al-Jawābarā. Riyadh, 1408/1988.

- ‘Almawī, ‘Abd al-Bāsiṭ. *Mukhtaṣar Tanbih al-ṭālib wa-irshād al-dāris*. Ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid. Damascus, 1366/1947.
- Asnawī, ‘Abd al-Rahīm b. Ḥasan. *Tabaqāt al-Šāfi‘īya*. Ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jubūrī. 2 vols. Baghdad, 1970/1390–1391/1971.
- Ayyūbī, Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Bāqī. *al-Manāhil al-salsala fi ’l-ahādīth al-musalsala*. Beirut, 1403/1983.
- Azami, M.M. *Studies in Early Ḥadīth Literature*. Indianapolis, 1978.
- Badrān, ‘Abd al-Qādir. *Munādamat al-āṭlāl wa-musāmarat al-khayāl*. Ed. Muḥammad Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh. Damascus, n.d.
- Baghawī. *Maṣābiḥ al-sunna*. Ed. Ibrāhīm Muḥammad Ramaḍān. 2 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- . *Sharh al-Sunna*. Ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnā’ūṭ and Muḥammad Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh. 16 vols. Damascus, 1390/1971 ff.
- Bahnasi, ‘Afif. *Mu‘jam muṣṭalāḥāt al-khaṭṭ al-‘Arabi wa-’l-khaṭṭātīn*. Beirut, 1995.
- Bayhaqī. *Kitāb al-Sunan al-kubrā*. 10 vols. Hyderabad, 1344–55.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2d ed. 2 vols. Leiden, 1943–9; *Supplementbände*. 3 vols. Leiden, 1937–42.
- Bukhārī. *Kitāb al-Du‘afā’ al-ṣaghīr*. Beirut, 1984.
- . *Kitāb al-Jāmi‘ al-ṣahīh*. Ed. Ludolf Krehl and T.W. Juynboll. 4 vols. Leiden, 1862–1908.
- . *Kitāb al-Kunā*. Hyderabad, 1360.
- . *al-Ta‘rīkh al-awṣaṭ*. 2 vols. Riyadh, 1998.
- . *al-Ta‘rīkh al-kabīr*. 4 vols. in 8 parts. Hyderabad, 1361–5.
- . *al-Ta‘rīkh al-ṣaghīr*. Ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid. 2 vols. Beirut, 1406/1986.
- Bulqīnī, Sirāj al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar al-Šāfi‘ī. *Maḥāsin al-iṣṭilāḥ wa-taḍīm Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ* (published with *Muqaddima*). Ed. Ā‘ishā ‘Abd al-Rahmān. 2nd edn. Cairo, 1989.
- Dāraqutnī. *Kitāb al-‘Ilal al-wārida fi ’l-ahādīth al-Nabawīya*. Ed. Maḥfūz al-Rahmān Zayn Allāh al-Salafi. Riyadh, 1405/1985.
- . *Kitāb al-Sunan*. 4 vols. Cairo, 1386/1966.
- . *Kitāb al-Tatabbū‘* (published with *al-Ilzāmāt*). Medina, 1397/1978.
- Dārimī, ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Sunan al-Dārimī*. Ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān. 2 vols. Damascus, 1349.
- Dārimī, Uthmān b. Sa‘īd. *al-Naqd ‘ala ’l-Marīsī al-‘anīd*. Ed. M.H. Fiqī. Cairo, 1358.
- . *al-Radd ‘ala ’l-Jahmiyya*. Ed. G. Vitestam. Leiden, 1960.
- Dāwūdī, Muḥammad b. ‘Ali. *Tabaqāt al-mufassirin*. Ed. ‘Ali Muḥammad ‘Umar. 2 vols. Cairo, 1392/1972.
- Dhahabi. *al-Kāshif fi ma‘rifat man lahu riwāya fi ’l-kutub al-sitta*. 3 vols. Cairo, 1392/1972.
- . *al-Mughnī fi ’l-du‘afā’*. Ed. Nūr al-Dīn Ḥatrī. 2 vols. Aleppo, 1391/1971.
- Dhahabi, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad. *al-‘Ibar fi khabar man ghabar*. Ed. Abū Hājjīr Muḥammad al-Sa‘īd b. Basyūnī Zaghlūl. 4 vols. Beirut, 1405/1985.

- Mizān al-ītidāl fī naqd al-rijāl*. Ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī. 4 vols. Cairo, 1382/1963.
- Siyar a‘lām al-nubalā*. Ed. Shu‘ayb al-Arnāqūt. 25 vols. Beirut, 1401/1981–1409/1988.
- Tadhkirat al-huffāz*. 4 vols. Hyderabad, 1955–8.
- Tārīkh al-Islām wa-wafayāt al-mashāhir wa-’l-a‘lām*. Ed. ‘Umar ‘Abd al-Salām al-Tadmuri. Beirut, 1407/1987 ff.
- Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Ed. Ehsan Yarshater. New York, 1984 ff.
- Encyclopaedia of Islam (EI)*. 1st ed., 4 vols. Leiden, 1908–36; 2d ed. Leiden, 1953 ff.
- EI<sup>P</sup> (Encyclopaedia of Islam)*. New Edition. Leiden, 1953 ff.
- EI Suppl (Encyclopaedia of Islam: Supplement)*. Leiden, 1938.
- Fattānī, Muḥammad Tāhir. *al-Mughnī fī qabṭ asmā’ al-rijāl*. Beirut, 1402/1982.
- Guillaume, Alfred. *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Ishāq’s Sirat Rasūl Allāh*. Oxford, 1955.
- Hajjī Khalīfa. *Kashf al-zunūn ‘an asāmī al-kutub wa-’l-funūn*. Ed. Mehmet Şerefettin Yalatkaya. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1360/1941–1362/1943.
- Al-Ḥākim al-Nisābūrī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh. *al-Madkhal ilā ma‘rifat al-Iklil*. Ed. and trans. James Robson. London, 1953.
- Ma‘rifat ‘ulūm al-hadīth*. Ed. al-Sayyid Mu‘azzam Husayn. Cairo, 1937.
- al-Mustadrak ‘ala ’l-Ṣāḥihayn*. 4 vols. Hyderabad, 1334–42.
- Halm, Heinz. *Die Ausbreitung der Šāfi‘itischen Rechtsschule von den Anfängen bis zum 8./14. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden, 1974.
- Hammām b. Munabbih. *Sahifat Hammām ibn Munabbih*. Ed. Rifā‘at Fawzī ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. Cairo, 1406/1985.
- Hamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmī. *Su‘ālāt Hamza b. Yūsuf al-Sahmī li-’l-Dāraqutnī wa-ghayrihi min al-mashāyikh*. Ed. Muwaffaq b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Qādir. Riyadh, 1404/1984.
- Hazimī. *al-Itibār fi ’l-nāsikh wa-’l-mansūkh*. Ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. Cairo, n.d.
- Hazimī, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Mūsa. *Shurūt al-ā‘imma al-khamṣa*. Ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī (bound with Ibn al-Qaysarānī, *Shurūt al-ā‘imma al-sitta*). Cairo, n.d.
- Humaydī. *Jadhwat al-muqtabis fī dhikr wulāt al-Andalus*. Cairo, 1966.
- Humphreys, R. Stephen. *From Saladin to the Mongols*. Albany, 1977.
- Husaynī, ‘Abd al-Raḥīm b. Hidāyat Allāh. *Tabaqāt al-Šāfi‘īya*. Ed. ‘Ādil Nuwayhiq. Beirut, 1971.
- Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr, Abū ‘Umar Yūsuf. *al-İsti‘āb fī ma‘rifat al-Āshāb*. Ed. ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Bajāwī. 4 vols. Cairo, n.d.
- Jāmi‘ bayān al-‘ilm wa-fadlihi*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Khaṭīb. Cairo, 1975.
- Kitāb al-Istighnā fī ma‘rifat al-mashhūrīn min ḥamalat al-‘ilm bi-’l-kunā*. Ed. ‘Abd Allāh Marḥūl al-Sawālima. 3 vols. Riyadh, 1405/1985..(Published Ed. ‘Amīr Ḥasan Ṣābṛī. Beirut, 1417/1996.

- al-Tamhid li-mā fi 'l-Muwatṭa'* min al-ma'āni wa-'l-asāni. Ed. Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad al-‘Alawī and Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Bakrī. [Rabat], 1387/1967 ff.
- Ibn Abī Ḥātim al-Rāzī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Ilal al-hadīth*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1343–44.
- Kitāb al-Jarh wa-'l-taqdīr*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yaḥyā al-Mu'allimī al-Yamānī. 4 vols. in 8 parts. Hyderabad, 1371/1952–1373/1953.
- Ibn Abi Yaqīl, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad. *Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābilā*. Ed. Muḥammad Hamīd al-Fiqī. 2 vols. Cairo, 1371/1952.
- Ibn ‘Adī. *al-Kāmil fi du'afā' al-rījāl*. 7 vols. Beirut, 1404/1984.
- Ibn al-Athīr. *al-Lubāb fi tahdhīb al-ansāb*. 3 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- Ibn Bashkuwāl. *Kitāb al-Ṣila*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1966.
- Ibn Daqīq al-Id, Abu 'l-Fath Muḥammad b. ‘Alī. *al-Iqtirāḥ fi bayān al-iṣṭilāḥ*. Ed. ‘Āmir Ḥasan Ṣabrī. Beirut, 1417/1996.
- Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī, Aḥmad b. Nūr al-Dīn. *al-Īṣāba fi tamyiz al-Ṣahāba*. Ed. A. Spenger and Maulawi Abd ul-Hai. 4 vols. Calcutta, 1854–73.
- Lisān al-Mīzān*. 6 vols. Hyderabad, 1329–31.
- al-Majmā' al-muḍassas bi-'l-Mu'jam al-mufahras*. Ed. Yūsuf ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Marqashlī. 4 vols. Beirut, 1413/1992–1415/1994.
- al-Nukhat 'alā Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*. Ed. Rabi‘ b. Hādi Umayr. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Riyadh, 1408/1988.
- Nuzhat al-naẓar fi tawḍīḥ Nukhbat al-fikar*. Benares, 1394/1974.
- Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*. 12 vols. Hyderabad, 1325–7.
- Ibn Ḥibbān, Muḥammad al-Bustī. *al-Iḥsān fi taqrīb Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Ed. Shu'ayb al-Arnā'ūt. 18 vols. 1408/1988.
- Kitāb al-Majrūḥin min al-muḥaddithīn wa-'l-qa'afā' wa-'l-matrūkin*. Ed. Maḥmūd Ibrāhīm Zāyid. 3 vols. Mecca, n.d.
- Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*. Ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir. Cairo, 1952.
- al-Thiqāt*. Hyderabad, 1973 ff.
- Ibn al-‘Imād, ‘Abd al-Hayy. *Shadharāt al-dhahab fi akhbār man dhahab*. 8 vols. Cairo, 1350–1.
- Ibn Isḥāq, Muḥammad. *The Life of Muhammad: A Translation of Ibn Isḥāq's Sirat Rasūl Allāh*. Trans. Alfred Guillaume. Oxford, 1955.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, Abu 'l-Farāj. *Kitāb al-Mawdū'āt*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad Uthmān. 3 vols. Medina, 1387/1966–1388/1968.
- Ibn Kathīr, Ẓīz al-Dīn. *al-Bā'ith al-ḥāthīth ilā ma'rifat 'ulūm al-hadīth*. Ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir. Cairo, 1355/1937.
- al-Bidāya wa-'l-nihāya*. 14 vols. Cairo, 1351/1932–1358.
- al-Lubāb fi tahdhīb al-ansāb*. 3 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- Ṭabaqāt al-fuqahā' al-Shāfi'iyya*. Ed. Aḥmad Umar Hāshim and Muḥammad Zaynūn Muḥammad Gharab. 3 vols. Cairo, 1413/1993.
- Ibn Khallikān, Abu 'l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Muḥammād. *Wafayāt al-a'yān wa-anbā' abnā' al-zamān*. Ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās, 8 vols. Beirut, 1968–72.

- Ibn Khayr al-Ishbili, Abū Bakr Muḥammad. *Fihrist mā rawāhu ‘an shuyūkhīhi*. 2nd edn. Cairo, 1382/1963.
- Ibn Khuzayma. *Şahih Ibn Khuzayma*. Ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Ażamī. 2 vols. Beirut, 1391/1971.
- Ibn Kinān, Muḥammad b. Ḥasan. *al-Murūj al-sundusiyā al-faṣīḥa fī talkhiṣ Ta’rīkh al-Ṣalīhiya*. Ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān. Damascus, 1366/1947.
- Ibn Māja, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Yazid al-Qazwīni. *Sunan Ibn Māja*. Ed. Fu’ad ‘Abd al-Baqī. 2 vols. Cairo, 1972.
- Ibn Mākūlā. *Al-Ikmāl fī raf‘ al-irtiyāb ‘an al-mu’talif wa-’l-mukhtalif min al-asmā’ wa-’l-kunā wa-’l-ansāb*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Yahyā al-Muallimī al-Yamanī. 6 vols. Hyderabad, 1962–7.
- Ibn al-Mustawfi, al-Mubārak b. Aḥmad. *Ta’rīkh Irbil*. Ed. Sāmī b. al-Sayyid Khamās al-Šaqqār. 2 vols. Baghdad, 1980.
- Ibn al-Nadīm. *Kitāb al-Fihrist*. Ed. Riḍā Tajaddud. N.p., n.d.
- Ibn Qaḍī Shuhba, Abū Bakr b. Aḥmad. *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyā*. Ed. ‘Abd al-‘Alīm Khān. 4 vols. Hyderabad, 1398/1978–1400/1980.
- Ibn al-Qaysarānī, Abu ‘l-Faḍl Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir. *Kitāb al-Ansāb al-muttafiqa fī ’l-khaṭṭ al-mutamāthila fi ’l-naqt wa-’l-dabṭ*. Ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Hūt. Beirut, 1411/1991.
- Shurūt al-a’imma al-sitta* (bound with Ḥażimī). *Shurūt al-a’imma al-khamṣa*. Ed. Muḥammad Zāhid al-Kawtharī. Cairo, n.d.
- Ibn Qutayba. *Kitāb Gharib al-ḥadīth*. Ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Jubūrī. Baghdad, 1977.
- Ta’wil mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*. Ed. Muḥammad Zuhrī al-Najjār. Cairo, 1386/1966; Trans. Gérard Lecomte. Le Trait des divergences du ḥadīth d’Ibn Qutayba. Damascus, 1962.
- Ibn Rāfi‘, Muḥammad. *Ta’rīkh ‘ulamā’ Baghdaḍ (al-musammā Muntakhab al-Mukhtār)*. Ed. ‘Abbās al-‘Azzāwī. Baghdad, 1357/1938.
- Ibn Rāhawayh. *Musnad Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Ghafūr ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Ḥusayn Barr al-Balūshi. Medina, 1410/1990.
- Ibn Rajab, ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Aḥmad. *Kitāb al-Dhayl ‘alā Tabaqāt al-Hanābila*. Ed. Muḥammad Ḥāmid al-Fiqi. 2 vols. Cairo, 1952–3.
- Ibn Rushayd, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. ‘Umar. *Miṣb al-‘ayba bi-mā jumi‘a bi-ṭūl al-ghayba*. Vol. 3. Ed. Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb b. al-Khūja. Tunis, 1981.
- Ibn Sa‘d. *al-Tabaqāt al-kubrā*. Ed. Iḥsān ‘Abbās. 9 vols. Beirut, 1380/1960–1388/1968.
- Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ, Taqī al-Dīn Abū ‘Amr Uthmān. *Adab al-muftī wa-’l-muṣtaftī*. Ed. Muwaffaq b. ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Qādir. N.p., 1407/1986.
- Fatāwā Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ fi ’l-tafsīr wa-’l-ḥadīth wa-’l-uṣūl wa-’l-‘aqāid*. [Cairo, n.p.], n.d.
- Fatāwā wa-masā’il Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ (sic)*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Mu‘ti Amin Qal‘ajī. 2 vols. Beirut, 1406/1986.
- Hilyat al-imām al-Shāfi‘i*. Ed. Bassām ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Jābi. Damascus, 1401/1981.

- *Ma'rifat anwā' cilm al-hadīth*. Ed. Ḥāfiẓa 'Abd al-Rahmān (under the title *Muqaddimat Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ wa-Mahāsin al-iṣṭilāḥ*). 2nd edn. Cairo, 1989; Ed. Nūr al-Dīn Iṭr (under the title *'Ulūm al-hadīth li-Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*). Aleppo, 1386/1966.
- *Tabaqāt al-fugahā' al-Shāfi'iya*. Ed. Muhyī al-Dīn 'Alī Najīb. 2 vols. Beirut, 1413/1992.
- Ibn Shaddād, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. 'Alī. *al-Aqlāq al-khaṭira fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa-'l-Jazīra*, vol. 1, part 1 (Aleppo). Ed. Dominique Sourdel. Damascus, 1953.
- *al-Aqlāq al-Khaṭira fī dhikr umarā' al-Shām wa-'l-Jazīra: Ta'rīkh madīnat Dimashq*. Ed. Sāmī al-Dahhān. Damascus, 1375/1956.
- Ibn Taghrī Birdī, Abu 'l-Mahāsin Yūsuf. *al-Nujūm al-zāhirah fī mulūk Miṣr wa-'l-Qāhirah*. 16 vols. Cairo, 1348/1929–1392/1972.
- Ibn Ṭūlūn, Muḥammad al-Šālihi. *al-Qalā'id al-jawhariyah fī ta'rīkh al-Šālihiyah*. Ed. Muḥammad Aḥmad Duhmān. 2 vols. Damascus, 1401/1980–1401/1981.
- Ṭrāqī, Abu 'l-Fadl Zayn al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahīm b. al-Ḥusayn. *al-Tabṣīra wa-'l-tadhkīra*. Ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Ṭrāqī al-Ḥusaynī. 3 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- *al-Taqyid wa-'l-idāh li-mā uṭliqa wa-ughliqa min Kitāb Ibn al-Ṣalāḥ*. Ed. 'Abd al-Rahmān Muḥammad Uthmān. Cairo, 1389/1969.
- Iṭr, Nur al-Dīn. *Lexique des termes techniques de la science du hadith*. Damascus, 1397/1977.
- Juynboll, G.H.A. *Muslim Tradition: Studies in Chronology, Provenance and Authorship of Early Hadith*. Cambridge, 1983.
- “Muslim's Introduction to his *Ṣaḥīḥ*” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 5(1984):263–311.
- Kattānī, Muḥammad b. Ja'far. *al-Risāla al-mustaṭrafa li-bayān mashhūr kutub al-sunna al-musharrifa*. 3rd edn. Damascus, 1383/1964.
- Khalīfa b. Khayyāt. *Tabaqāt*. Ed. Suhayl Zakkār. Damascus, 1966; Ed. Akram 'Diyā' al-Ūmarī. Baghdad, 1967.
- *Ta'rīkh Khalīfa ibn Khayyāt*. Ed. Suhayl Zakkār. 2 vols. Damascus, 1967–8.
- Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. 'Alī. *al-Faṣl li-'l-waṣl al-mudraj fi 'l-naql*. Ed. Muḥammad b. Maṭar al-Zahrānī. 2 vols. Riyad, 1418/1997.
- *Al-Ijāza li-'l-mā'dūm wa-'l-majhūl*. In Subḥī al-Badrī al-Sāmarrā'ī. *Majmū'at rasā'il fī 'Ulūm al-hadīth*. Medina, 1389/1969.
- *Al-Jāmi' li-akhlāq al-rāwī wa-ādāb al-sāmī'*. Ed. Abū 'Abd al-Rahmān Ṣalāḥ b. Muḥammad b. Ūwayūn. Beirut, 1417/1996.
- *Kitāb al-Kifāya fī 'ilm al-riwāya*. Hyderabad, 1357.
- *Kitāb Talkhiṣ al-mutashābih fi 'l-rasm*. Ed. Sukayna al-Shihābī. 2 vols. Damascus, 1985.
- *Ta'rīkh Baghdaḍ*. 14 vols. Cairo, 1349/1931.
- Khaṭṭābī. *Aqlām al-Sunan*. Ed. Yūsuf al-Kattānī. 2 vols. Rabat, n.d.
- *Ma'ālim al-Sunan*. Ed. Muḥammad Rāghib al-Tabbākh. 4 vols. Aleppo, 1351/1932–1352/1934.

- Laknawī, Abu 'l-Hasanāt Muḥammad 'Abd al-Ḥayy. *al-Ajwiba al-fāḍila li-'l-aṣila al-`ashara al-kāmila*. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda. Aleppo, 1384/1964.
- . *al-Fawā'id al-bahiyā fi tarājim al-Ḥanafiyā*. Beirut, n.d.
- . *al-Raṣṭ wa-'l-takmila fi 'l-jarḥ wa-'l-ta'ṣil*. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghudda. Aleppo, n.d.
- Lālakā'i. *Sharḥ uṣūl iṭiqād ahl al-sunna wa-'l-jamā'a*. Ed. Aḥmad Sa'īd Hamdān. 2d ed. 4 vols. Riyadħ, 1411.
- Lane, Edward W. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. 8 vols. London, 1863–93.
- Laoust, Henri. *La Profession de foi d'Ibn Baṭṭa*. Damascus, 1958.
- Mahmūd al-`Adawī. *Kitāb al-Ziyārāt bi-Dimashq*. Ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Munajjid. Damascus, 1956.
- Makdisi, George. *The Rise of Colleges: Institutions of Learning in Islam and the West* (Edinburgh, 1981).
- Mayyānišī, Abū Ḥafṣ. *Mā lā yas'ū al-muḥaddith jahluhū*. Ed. Subḥī al-Samarrā'i. Baghdad, 1967. Trans. L. Librande, "The supposed homogeneity of technical terms in ḥadīth study," *Muslim World*, 72 (1982):34–50.
- Miura, Toru. "The Ṣālihiya quarter in the suburbs of Damascus." *Bulletin d'études orientales*, 47 (1995).
- Mizzī. *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl fī asmā' al-rijāl*. Ed. Bashshār 'Awwād Ma'rūf. 35 vols. Beirut, 1406/1985–1413/1992.
- al-Mu'azzam Tsā. *Kitāb al-Radd 'alā Abī Bakr al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādī*. Cairo, 1351/1932.
- Munajjid, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn. "Ijāzāt al-samā' fi 'l-makhtūṭāt al-qadima." In *Revue de l'Institut des Manuscrits Arabes*, 1 (1375/1955): 232–51.
- Muslim b. al-Hajjāj. *Kitāb al-Munfaridāt wa-'l-wuḍān*. Ed. 'Abd al-Ghaffār Sulaymān al-Bundārī. Beirut, 1408/1988.
- . *Kitāb al-Tamyiz*. Ed. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā al-Ażamī. Riyadħ, n.d.
- . *al-Sāmi' al-ṣāḥih*, 8 vols. Istanbul, 1329–33.
- Nasā'i, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Aḥmad b. Shu'ayb. *Sunan al-Nasā'i*. 8 vols. Cairo, ca. 1930.
- Nawawī, Abū Zakariyā Muhyī al-Dīn. *Tahdhīb al-asmā' wa-'l-lughāt*. 4 vols. (Cairo; nd).
- . *al-Taqrīb li-'l-Nawawī*. Cairo, 1388/1968. Trans. William Marçais. *Le Taqrīb de en-Nawawī*. Paris, 1902.
- Nuṣaymi, 'Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad. *al-Dāris fī ta'rīkh al-madāris*. Ed. Ja'far al-Hasanī. 2 vols. Damascus, 1948/1367–1951/1370.
- Paşa, İsmail. *Hadiyat al-ṭārifīn: asmā' al-mu'allifīn wa-āthār al-muṣannifīn*. Ed. Kılıslı Rifat Bilge and İbnülemin Mahmud Kemal İnal. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1951–5.
- . *İdāh al-maknūn fi 'l-dhayl 'alā Kashf al-zunūn*. Ed. Mehmet Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kılıslı Rifat Bilge, 2 vols. Istanbul, 1364/1945–1366/1947.
- Pouzet, Louis. *Damas au VIIe/XIIIe siècle: Vie et structures religieuses [dans] d'une métropole islamique*. Beirut, 1988.
- Al-Qādi Iyād. *al-Ilmā' ilā ma'rifat uṣūl al-rimāya wa-taqyīd al-samā'*. Ed. al-Sayyid Aḥmad Şaqr. Cairo, 1389/1970.

- Mashāriq al-anwār ‘alā ṣaḥīḥ al-āthār*. 2 vols. Beirut, n.d.
- Qiftī. *Inbāh al-ruwāt ‘alā anbā’ al-nuḥāt*. Ed. Muḥammad Abu ’l-Fadl Ibrāhim. 4 vols. Cairo, 1369/1950–73.
- Rāmahurmuzī, al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *al-Muḥaddith al-faṣil bayn al-rāwi wa-’l-wā‘i*. Ed: Muḥammad ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb. Beirut, 1391/1971.
- Robson, James. “Traditions from Individuals.” In *Journal of Semitic Studies* 9 (1964):327–40.
- Rosenthal, Franz. “Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī on Penmanship.” In *Four Essays on Art and Literature in Islam*. Leiden, 1971.
- A History of Muslim Historiography*. 2nd edn. Leiden, 1968.
- The Technique and Approach of Muslim Scholarship*. Rome, 1947.
- Şafadı, Khalil b. Aybak. *al-Wāfi bi-’l-wafayāt*. Ed. Hellmut Ritter et al. Istanbul/Wiesbaden, 1931 ff.
- Sakhawī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Fatḥ al-Mughith [‘alā] sharḥ Alfiyat al-ḥadīth li-’l-‘Irāqī*. 2nd edn. 3 vols. Medina, 1388/1968–1389/1969.
- al-Iqlān bi-’l-tawbikh li-man dhamma ahl al-ta’rikh*. Ed. Franz Rosenthal. Beirut, 1407/1987.
- Sakhawī. *al-Jawāhir wa-’l-durar fi tarjamat shaykh al-Islām Ibn Hajar*. Ed. Hāmid ‘Abd al-Majīd and Tāhā al-Zaynī. Only one vol. published. Cairo, 1406/1986.
- Salisbury, Edward E. “Contributions from original sources to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition.” In *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 7 (1862):60–142.
- Sam‘ānī, Abū Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr. *Ādāb al-imlā’ wa-’l-istmlā’*. Ed. Max Weisweiler. Leiden, 1952.
- al-Ansāb*. Ed. ‘Abd Allāh al-Bārūdī. 5 vols. Beirut, 1408/1988.
- Sayyid, Fuḍād. *Fihrist al-makhtūṭat: muṣṭalaḥ al-ḥadīth*. Cairo, 1375/1956.
- Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums*. 10 vols. Leiden, 1967–95.
- Sibī b. al-Jawzī, Abu ’l-Muẓaffar Yūsuf b. Quzughli. *Mirāt al-zamān fi ta’rikh al-a‘yān*. Vol. 8 in two parts. Hyderabad, 1370/1951–1371/1952.
- Sourdel, Dominique. “Les Professeurs de Madrasa à Alep aux XIIe–XIIIe siècles d’après Ibn Shaddād.” In *Bulletin d’études orientales*, 13 (1949–51).
- Subki, Tāj al-Dīn Abū Naṣr ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. Taqī al-Dīn. *Tabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyā al-kubrā*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Faṭṭāḥ Muḥammad al-Hilw and Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Tanāḥī. 10 vols. Cairo, 1383/1963–[1396]/1976.
- Suyūṭī, Jalāl al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Husn al-muḥādāra fi ta’rikh Miṣr wa-’l-Qāhira*. Ed. Muḥammad Abu ’l-Fadl Ibrāhim. 2 vols. Cairo, 1387/1967–1387/1968.
- Tabaqāt al-ḥuffāz*. Ed. ‘Ali Muḥammad Umar. Cairo, 1393/1973.
- Tabaqāt al-mufassirin*. Ed. ‘Ali Muḥammad Umar. Cairo, 1396/1976.
- Tadrib al-rāwi fi sharḥ Taqrīb al-Nawāwī (sic)*. Ed. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb ‘Abd al-Laṭīf. 2nd edn. 2 vols. Cairo, 1385/1966.
- Tabarānī, Sulaymān b. Aḥmad. *al-Mu‘jam al-ṣaghīr*. Ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Hūt. Beirut, 1406/1986.

- Tahānawī, Muḥammad ‘Alī b. ‘Alī. *Kashshāf iṣṭilāhāt al-funūn*. 2 vols. [Istanbul], 1317.
- Tībāwī, ‘Abd al-Laṭīf. “Ba‘d al-madāris al-Islāmīya fi ’l-Quds al-sharīf fī ḥakīm al-qarn al-tāsi‘ al-hijrī.” In *Majallat Majma‘ al-lugha al-‘Arabiya bi-Dimashq*, 58 (1403/1983).
- Tirmidhī. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Tirmidhī (bi-sharh al-imām Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī)*. 13 vols. Cairo, 1350/1931–1352/1334.
- Ulābī, Akram Ḥasan. *Khiṭāṭ Dimashq*. Damascus, 1410/1989.
- Ulaymī, *al-Uṣn al-jalil bi-ta’rīkh al-Quds wa-’l-Khalīl*. Ed. Muḥammad Bahār al-‘Ulūm. 2 vols. Nājaf, 1388/1968.
- Yaḥyā b. Ma‘īn. *al-Ta’rīkh*. Ed. Aḥmad Muḥammad Nūr Sayf. 4 vols. Mecca, 1979.
- Ya‘qūb b. Shayba. *Musnad Amīr al-mu‘minin ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb*. Ed. Kamāl Yūsuf al-Ḥūt. Beirut, 1985.
- Ya‘qūb b. Sufyān al-Fasawī. *Kitāb al-Ma‘rifā wa-’l-ta’rīkh*. Ed. Akram Ḏiyā’ al-‘Umari. 2nd edn. 3 vols. Beirut, 1401/1981.
- Yāqūt, Abū ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd Allāh. *Mu‘jam al-buldān*. Ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld. 6 vols. Leipzig, 1866–73.
- Zakariyā’ al-Anṣārī, Zayn al-Dīn Abū Yaḥyā Zakariyā’ b. Muḥammad al-Sakanī al-Azharī. *Fath al-Bāqī ‘alā Alfiyat al-‘Irāqī* (published with Ḥāfiẓ al-Tabṣīra wa-’l-tadhkīra). Ed. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-‘Irāqī al-Ḥusaynī. 3 vols. Beirut, n.d.